1	STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
2	COUNTY OF RAMSEY SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3	
4	The State of Minnesota,
5	by Hubert H. Humphrey, III,
6	its attorney general,
7	and
8	Blue Cross and Blue Shield
9	of Minnesota,
10	Plaintiffs,
11	vs. File No. C1-94-8565
12	Philip Morris Incorporated, R.J.
13	Reynolds Tobacco Company, Brown &
14	Williamson Tobacco Corporation,
15	B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., Lorillard
16	Tobacco Company, The American
17	Tobacco Company, Liggett Group, Inc.,
18	The Council for Tobacco Research-U.S.A.,
19	Inc., and The Tobacco Institute, Inc.,
20	Defendants.
21	
22	
23	DEPOSITION OF CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR
24	Volume I, Pages 1 - 309
25	

http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tie//dlmp5a00/pdfindustrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tlhd0001

1	(The following is the deposition of
2	CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR, taken pursuant to Notice of
3	Taking Deposition by Rule 30.02(f), by videotape, at
4	the offices of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, Attorneys
5	at Law, 425 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York, on
6	August 12, 1997, commencing at approximately 8:36
7	o'clock a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:
14	Martha K. Wivell
15	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi
16	2800 LaSalle Plaza
17	800 LaSalle Avenue
18	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015
19	
20	On Behalf of Lorillard Tobacco Company:
21	Howard A. Roston
22	Doherty, Rumble & Butler
23	2800 Minnesota World Trade Center
24	30 East Seventh Street
25	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-4999

1	On Behalf of Philip Morris Incorporated:
2	Daniel J. Ballintine
3	Dorsey & Whitney LLP
4	Pillsbury Center South
5	220 South Sixth Street
6	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-1498
7	
8	On Behalf of British-American Tobacco Company
9	Limited:
10	Bruce G. Sheffler and Gregory M. Loss
11	Chadbourne & Parke LLP
12	30 Rockefeller Plaza
13	New York, New York 10112
14	
15	Dr. Kim Davis and Carolyn Martin
16	Lovell White Durrant
17	527 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
18	New York, New York 10022
19	
20	On Behalf of B.A.T. Industries P.L.C.:
21	Andrew T. Frankel
22	Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
23	425 Lexington Avenue
24	New York, New York 10017-3954
25	

1	On Behalf of BAT (U.K. & Export) Limited:
2	Byron E. Starns
3	Leonard, Street & Deinard
4	30 East Seventh Street, Suite 2270
5	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
6	
7	ALSO PRESENT:
8	John Ramonetti, Legal Assistant
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1		I N D E X	
2	EXHIBITS	DESCRIPTION P.	AGE MARKED
3	Proctor 584	Notice of Taking Deposition,	
4		3 pages	8
5	585	12th May 1975 Item 4 (f),	
6		B.A.T. Tobacco Division, The	
7		Use of Animals in Research	
8		Programmes, Bates 100428118	41
9	586	Smoking and Health, Strategi	es
10		and Constraints, Bates	
11		500006558-75	48
12	587	1982 B.A.T. Board Guidelines	,
13		Public Affairs, Bates	
14		680585233-67	120
15	588	Talk to Conference, Marketin	g
16		Low Delivery Products, Bates	
17		109841239-44	124
18	589	13th July 1973 B.A.T.:	
19		Approach to Smoking and	
20		Health, Bates 105359751-3	126
21	590	Responses and Objections of	
22		B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. to	
23		Plaintiffs' First Set of	
24		Requests for Admission to BA	Т
25		Industries P.L.C., 7 pages	139
		STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES	

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/dimდ5a00/pdfindustrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tlhd0001

1	591	28th April 1977 letter, from	
2		Short, Bates 100427791-800	173
3	592	Change of Stance on Smoking	
4		and Health, Bates 109881312-8	199
5	593	Comments on "Smoking and	
6		Health," paper by Dr. F.G.	
7		Colby, Bates 100440293-7	212
8	594	Visit to B&W, Louisville,	
9		23-25 January 1984, Bates	
10		109837925-8	226
11	595	4th May 1982 letter, Roe to	
12		Thornton, Bates 100432193-203	236
13	596	CACVIII, Proposition, Bates	
14		103366389-93	247
15	597	Conference on Inhalation	
16		Toxicology, Group Research	
17		and Development Centre,	
18		Southampton 7 - 9 August	
19		1974, Bates 105318954-8	263
20	598	Conclusions and	
21		Evaluations, Final Draft,	
22		Bates 104745492-502	272
23			
24			
25			

1	599	1.3.57 Report No. RD.14 -	
2		R, Smoke Group, Programme	
3		for coming 12-16 week period,	
4		Bates 105471399, 401, 403,	
5		405, 407, 409, 411, 413,	
6		415, 417	289
7			
8			
9	2906	August 5, 1997 letter, Wivell	
10		to Starns, 14 pages	99
11	2907	August 8, 1997 facsimile	
12		message, Wivell to Starns,	
13		3 pages	99
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Plaintiffs' Exhibit 584 was marked
3	for identification.)
4	MR. SHEFFLER: Before we begin the
5	deposition, let me make two objections with respect
6	to this proceeding today. Dr. Proctor is here today
7	pursuant to a amended deposition notice that was
8	served on B.A.T. Industries and the British-American
9	Tobacco Company Limited for a 30.02(f) witness on a
10	list of eight purported subjects. We object insofar
11	as the list in the amended notice of deposition
12	includes subjects six, seven and eight: collection
13	and production of Category II documents in this
14	litigation; advertising, marketing, promotion of
15	cigarettes; and youth smoking. There have been
16	numerous discussions between counsel for plaintiffs
17	and defendants with respect to the scope of this
18	deposition. The discussion could not be more clear
19	that B.A.T. Industries and the British-American
20	Tobacco Company were asked to produce a witness to
21	address only the topics one through five: public
22	statements relating to the health effects of smoking
23	and addiction and scientific research; health effects
24	of smoking; addiction; research and development
25	activities; and the control of nicotine and other

- 1 reinforcing substances in cigarettes and design and
- 2 manufacture of cigarettes re same.
- 3 That is what Dr. Proctor is prepared to address
- 4 and that is what we intend to have this deposition
- 5 limited to because those were the subject matters
- 6 discussed. To the extent that the deposition notice
- 7 as served purports to require B.A.T. Industries or
- 8 British-American Tobacco Company to produce a witness
- 9 for six, seven and eight, those subjects are not part
- 10 of this deposition pursuant to our discussions.
- 11 Secondly, counsel for the plaintiffs have served
- 12 upon us a predesignated list of documents. We object
- 13 to the manner in which counsel has selected to serve
- 14 those documents. We received a list of some 500
- 15 documents comprising over 6,000 pages of material
- 16 designated to -- for use for this deposition. To
- 17 expect that counsel in five days could review those
- 18 documents and prepare Dr. Proctor for this deposition
- 19 is ridiculous. It took us an entire day just to
- 20 retrieve and copy this voluminous set of documents.
- Now, the review which we were able to do of
- 22 these documents demonstrates that they deal with a
- 23 wide range of topics. There's many subjects which
- 24 are totally irrelevant to the topics listed for this
- 25 deposition. In addition, some of the documents

- 1 appear to be single pages of -- of a multi set. The
- 2 first and second pages of complete R&D reports
- 3 were -- were produced, and it demonstrates a complete
- 4 lack of selectivity on the part of the plaintiffs, a
- 5 lack of selectivity that was -- is especially
- 6 egregious in light of the meet and confers which were
- 7 had with respect to the 30.02(f) depositions. In
- 8 those meet and confers was recognized that the topics
- 9 one through five, which are the subject of this
- 10 deposition, were overly broad, cover a wide range of
- 11 materials, millions of pages of documents and over 40
- 12 years of history. During the meet and confers,
- 13 plaintiff re -- plaintiffs' counsel represented that
- 14 they would limit the scope and define the scope of
- 15 these topics through their designation of documents.
- 16 By designating over 500 documents, there has
- 17 been absolutely no attempt to give the counsel for
- 18 defendants any idea of the scope or no attempt to
- 19 limit in any way the overbreadth of these topics.
- 20 There can be no reasonable expectation for counsel to
- 21 expect to use even a tenth of the documents she has
- 22 designated for this deposition, and we believe and
- 23 object on the grounds that the predesignation of all
- 24 these documents is not in the spirit or the letter of
- 25 the judge's order on predesignation and certainly is

- 1 contrary to counsel's representations in the meet and
- 2 confer with respect to these 30.02(f) depositions.
- 3 Subject to those -- those objections, we will
- 4 proceed with the deposition and do the best that we
- 5 can.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: Well I'm going to respond to
- 7 the statement you've made.
- 8 Number one, we have already taken the deposition
- 9 of Martyn Gilbey on point six of the deposition
- 10 notice, which will be marked as Plaintiffs'
- 11 Exhibit -- which has already been marked as
- 12 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 584. I never agreed not to
- 13 include points seven and eight, nor have any of my
- 14 colleagues agreed not to include points seven and
- 15 eight in the deposition. The deposition was noticed
- 16 for eight points. We've taken point six.
- I have reviewed the transcripts of the two meet
- 18 and confers that are on the record concerning this
- 19 deposition, and there is no -- none of the concerns
- 20 that you expressed here are in those meet-and-confer
- 21 transcripts and there is no indication on behalf of
- 22 the plaintiffs that they are going to limit their
- 23 deposition to points one through five. I did not say
- 24 that we were going to limit our deposition to points
- 25 one through five in the meet and confers I had with

- 1 defense counsel, and I don't know where you get the
- 2 idea that therefore you can unilaterally limit the
- 3 scope of this deposition, which was properly
- 4 noticed. That's point number one.
- 5 Point number two: Your statement about 500
- 6 documents is inaccurate. It's just not correct.
- 7 There are some over 400 documents which were
- 8 designated for this deposition, not 500. They all
- 9 concern the subjects in one way or another that are
- 10 listed on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 584. We did the
- 11 predesignation in conn -- as the court directed. I
- 12 would like to point out that defense counsel has in
- 13 the past in depositions which have been taken of the
- 14 State of Minnesota and Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 15 designated well over 500 documents and in fact I
- 16 believe it's 30,000 pages of testimony and in fact in
- 17 one point served a designation or a supplemental
- 18 designation on our office during the time that a
- 19 deposition was going on.
- 20 So I don't believe that our designation of
- 21 documents in any way violates any court order or
- 22 prohibited you from preparing. I notice that you
- 23 have a number, three -- at least six, seven lawyers
- 24 sitting here today for this deposition, and I'm
- 25 assuming that since you have demonstrated to us in

- 1 Martyn Gilbey's deposition and Martyn Gilbey
- 2 testified about the various computer indices that you
- 3 have, that you have -- perfectly capable of
- 4 retrieving those documents.
- 5 Furthermore, while we may only use a portion of
- 6 those documents at this deposition, depending upon
- 7 the witness -- what the witness says, we may use
- 8 others that we had not planned on using in our case
- 9 in chief simply to cross-examine him about claims
- 10 that he may make while responding to documents we had
- 11 planned on using in our examination in chief. So we
- 12 have to designate documents beyond those that we
- 13 might actually intend to use in our examination for
- 14 either cross-examination or response to your direct
- 15 examination, should you have some, and that's a
- 16 problem I understand and that's a problem we've all
- 17 been living with because so far my designation hasn't
- 18 come even close to some of the designations which the
- 19 defendants have served on the plaintiffs and which
- 20 we've had to live with. And the court's well aware
- 21 of the voluminous nature of some of the designations
- 22 that the defendant -- defendants have made on the
- 23 plaintiffs.
- 24 That say -- that said, I think we should go
- 25 forward with the deposition.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Let me just respond and very
- 2 brief. I would refer you to a July 18th, 1997
- 3 correspondence between Mr. McCormack of my office and
- 4 you which reflects the discussions we had with
- 5 respect to the scope. I don't think it could be more
- 6 clear. Having said that, go ahead.
- 7 MS. WIVELL: Well that reflects
- 8 Mr. McCormack's view of the discussions which we had,
- 9 not my accession to those views.
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: And you did not send any
- 11 correspondence to correct --
- 12 MS. WIVELL: That -- I was in London,
- 13 Counsel, as you well know taking depositions at the
- 14 time that that letter was sent. In fact, I think
- 15 it -- what's the date of that letter?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: July 18th, 1997.
- MS. WIVELL: We were actually taking
- 18 depositions at the time that letter was sent by
- 19 Mr. McCormack or --
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Why don't we proceed with
- 21 the questions and we'll see how we go.
- MS. WIVELL: All right.
- 23 (Witness sworn.)
- 24 CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR
- 25 called as a witness, being first duly

- 1 sworn, was examined and testified
- 2 as follows:
- 3 ADVERSE EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 5 Q. Would you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the
- 6 jury your name.
- 7 A. Christopher John Proctor.
- 8 Q. And by whom are you employed?
- 9 A. British-American Tobacco Company Limited.
- 10 Q. How long have you been employed by
- 11 British-American Tobacco Company Limited?
- 12 A. I've been employed a couple of times, the first
- 13 time for approximately seven years, slightly less,
- 14 and -- and -- and then since 1993 to the current
- 15 date.
- 16 Q. All right. What do you do --
- 17 By the way, can we call British-American Tobacco
- 18 Company Limited BATCO?
- 19 A. That will be fine, if that's the way you want to
- 20 refer to it.
- 21 Q. All right. Well that's the way it's referred to
- 22 it by employees of the company, isn't it?
- 23 A. Some will say "BATCO." I tend to say
- 24 "British-American Tobacco," but "BATCO" is fine.
- 25 Q. All right. What do you do for BATCO?

- 1 A. I'm the head of science and regulation as a part
- 2 of a -- a group of British-American Tobacco which is
- 3 called consumer and regulatory affairs.
- 4 Q. How long have you held that position?
- 5 A. It's a relatively new position in the company,
- 6 and I've held that, oh, I guess about a year and a
- 7 half.
- 8 Q. Before you held that position, what did you do?
- 9 A. I was the head of smoking issues, both of which
- 10 are -- were similar jobs.
- 11 Q. And when did you become the head of smoking
- 12 issues?
- 13 A. When I joined the company in 1993.
- 14 Q. All right. Have we talked about all the
- 15 positions you've held since you rejoined BATCO in
- 16 1993?
- 17 A. Those are the two, yes.
- 18 Q. Now you said you were with BATCO for seven years
- 19 before then.
- 20 A. Yes. I was employed at the research
- 21 establishment in Southampton, which had various names
- 22 during that time, but from 1983 through till pretty
- 23 much the end of 1989 I held various scientific
- 24 positions there.
- 25 Q. All right. Did you start with BATCO in 1983?

- 1 A. Yes, that was my first job, and I'm not sure
- 2 whether it was BATCO or British-American Tobacco
- 3 (U.K. & Export). There were various employment
- 4 contracts during that time, but generally I think
- 5 British-American Tobacco Company Limited.
- 6 Q. And what position did you have when you began in
- 7 1983?
- 8 A. I started off as a research scientist.
- 9 Q. Did that change?
- 10 A. No. I -- I continued being a research scientist
- 11 through my -- my period in -- in R&D, but taking
- 12 various different positions within the research
- 13 establishment.
- 14 Q. What department were you in --
- 15 A. I --
- 16 Q. -- when you started?
- 17 A. I started in a group that looked at analytical
- 18 chemistry and focused very much on research in
- 19 relation to environmental tobacco smoke.
- 20 Q. Who was your supervisor?
- 21 A. I had several. My initial supervisor was a
- 22 gentleman called Mr. Dymond.
- 23 Q. And after that?
- 24 A. If I can remember, I think at one stage a
- 25 Dr. Binns.

- 1 Q. And after that?
- 2 A. Let me try and remember. I think a Dr. Baker,
- 3 but I can't remember entirely who I was -- who I was
- 4 directly reporting to.
- 5 Q. Now did you ever be -- during the -- strike
- 6 that. Let me begin again.
- 7 From the period 1983 to 1989, did you stay
- 8 within the analytical chemistry area?
- 9 A. Sort of. I mean, what I did was -- was to build
- 10 my own group of research there focusing upon
- 11 environmental tobacco smoke, various aspects of that
- 12 type of research.
- 13 Q. Now by "environmental tobacco smoke," do you
- 14 mean sidestream smoke?
- 15 A. No. I mean tobacco smoke present in the air.
- 16 Sidestream smoke is a smoke which just comes off the
- 17 end of the cigarette, and I have done some research
- 18 in relation to that and in fact developed a technique
- 19 whereby you could measure sidestream smoke.
- 20 Q. So by "environmental tobacco smoke," you would
- 21 include that which is exhaled by the smoker?
- 22 A. Yeah. I mean, environmental tobacco smoke would
- 23 be smoke found in a room and that would arise
- 24 primarily from sidestream smoke and exhaled smoke,
- 25 but it would be diluted in the air.

- 1 Q. All right. Did I ask you if you became a
- 2 supervisor during the period 1983 to 1989?
- 3 A. If by "supervisor" you mean did I have staff
- 4 working for me, then in -- in various times, yes.
- 5 Q. All right. Well why don't you explain to the
- 6 ladies and gentlemen the progression of your work
- 7 from 1983 to 1989.
- 8 A. Okay, as far as I can remember. The first set
- 9 of research that I undertook was really developing a
- 10 variety of analytical techniques, analytical
- 11 techniques trying to measure sidestream smoke, which
- 12 is quite a complex thing to do in a standardized
- 13 manner. We developed a system called a fishtail
- 14 chimney system that was published in a journal called
- 15 "The Analyst" I think in about 1988, which has been,
- 16 I mean, not widely accepted, but certainly has become
- 17 part of -- of the standardized techniques to try and
- 18 evaluate sidestream smoke and measure it in a -- in a
- 19 way which is consistent. We also did a lot of
- 20 research trying to find ways to measure environmental
- 21 tobacco smoke, various constituents of environmental
- 22 tobacco smoke, again in a standardized manner. And
- 23 that we did both in the laboratory setting -- we
- 24 built rooms where we could produce a controlled
- 25 amount of environmental tobacco smoke -- and in

- 1 external environment. So for example, we did a study
- 2 whereby we -- we tried to assess the exposure of
- 3 nonsmoking people in a city in the middle of the
- 4 country called Birmingham, and again, I mean, both
- 5 those areas of research we researched and we wrote up
- 6 and we published in the open literature.
- 7 Q. Now have you described all of the positions that
- 8 you've had from 1983 to 1989 at either BATCO or
- 9 BATUKE?
- 10 A. As much as I can. Right -- right before I left
- 11 the company, I was also given an area called
- 12 chemosensory research for a very short period and it
- 13 wasn't an area that I really got into. So the -- the
- 14 job titles varied at different points of time, but
- 15 what I tried to broadly explain is the areas of
- 16 research that I undertook, and at various times
- 17 during that period I would have had different people
- 18 working under me on those types of areas.
- 19 Q. Now you mentioned chemosensory research. What
- 20 do you understand that area to include?
- 21 A. No, it was -- it was sensory research. Did I
- 22 misspeak? I'm sorry.
- 23 Q. All right. Well let me ask you this: Were you
- 24 involved in chemosensory research?
- 25 A. As I said, what -- an area of research that was

- 1 started again within -- in the research establishment
- 2 in 1989 was to look at chemosensory research, and --
- 3 and what was meant by that was trying to identify the
- 4 chemistry related to the taste of tobacco smoke. But
- 5 it's an area that I just started to get involved in
- 6 and -- and then decided to leave the company at that
- 7 stage.
- 8 Q. When you left the company, where did you go?
- 9 A. I -- I left the company entirely and went to
- 10 work in Washington, D.C.
- 11 Q. For what group?
- 12 A. I became a -- a senior scientific advisor for a
- 13 law firm called Covington & Burling.
- 14 Q. And you actually became an employee of
- 15 Covington & Burling?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 Q. And what were your responsibilities at
- 18 Covington & Burling?
- 19 A. Providing advice to the attorneys on various
- 20 scientific matters.
- 21 Q. Including tobacco additives?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, and I think this
- 23 may go into the area of work product. I'm going to
- 24 instruct the witness not to answer.
- 25 Q. How long were you a senior research scientist at

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Covington & Burling?
- 2 A. I was a senior scientific advisor with Covington
- 3 Burling from I think about January 1990 through to
- 4 the middle of '93 when I returned to British-American
- 5 Tobacco Company Limited.
- 6 Q. Now just so the ladies and gentlemen are clear,
- 7 Covington & Burling is a law firm that advises
- 8 various tobacco companies, doesn't it?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 10 Q. I'm sorry?
- 11 A. Covington Burling is a law firm based in
- 12 Washington that has a whole series of clients. One
- 13 of those clients certainly when I was employed was
- 14 The Tobacco Institute.
- 15 Q. And Covington Burling also had various tobacco
- 16 manu -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 17 Covington & Burling also had various cigarette
- 18 manufacturers as clients while you were employed
- 19 there; right?
- 20 A. Yes. There would have been advice I think given
- 21 by Covington Burling to -- to various cigarette
- 22 manufacturers.
- 23 Q. And so in your position as a research advisor to
- 24 Covington & Burling, you provided advice to The
- 25 Tobacco Institute; is that right?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 3 A. I provided advice to the attorneys, who
- 4 presumably gave advice to The -- The Tobacco
- 5 Institute.
- 6 Q. And --
- 7 A. My role was to -- to -- to look at the
- 8 scientific data and provide that support to the
- 9 attorneys.
- 10 Q. Okay. Now, as head of science and regulation
- 11 for BATCO, what do your job responsibilities
- 12 currently include?
- 13 A. Yeah, let me try and explain the role of -- of
- 14 the group. The consumer and regulatory affairs
- 15 department is responsible for -- for public
- 16 statements in relation to -- to anything related to
- 17 the British-American Tobacco Company's business.
- 18 Science and regulation is very much focused upon
- 19 acquiring a full understanding of -- of the
- 20 scientific literature in relation to smoking and
- 21 health, and in -- in addition to that I chair a group
- 22 called the Scientific Research Group, which funds
- 23 independent research at various universities, looking
- 24 into scientific research related to smoking and
- 25 health.

- 1 Q. Now you mentioned a consumer and regulatory
- 2 affairs department and then you mentioned science and
- 3 regulation. Are they two different departments?
- 4 A. No. It's -- the over -- the umbrella department
- 5 is called consumer and regulatory affairs. Within
- 6 that there are four groups of, I guess you could call
- 7 it, departments. The one that I head up is -- is
- 8 called science and regulation.
- 9 Q. Who heads the entire department for BATCO?
- 10 A. There is a board director responsible for
- 11 consumer and regulatory affairs, a gentleman called
- 12 Mr. -- Mr. Paul Adams.
- 13 Q. By "board director," which board are you
- 14 referring to?
- 15 A. He is on the board of British-American Tobacco
- 16 Holdings Limited.
- 17 Q. Now British-American Tobacco Holdings Limited
- 18 was established last year; isn't that right?
- 19 A. At the beginning of last year.
- 20 Q. All right. Was Mr. Adams responsible for the
- 21 consumer and regulatory affairs department before
- 22 British-American Tobacco Holdings Limited was
- 23 established?
- 24 A. No, it wasn't, and -- and consumer and
- 25 regulatory affairs wasn't formed until

- 1 British-American Tobacco Holdings was formed. Prior
- 2 to that, the department that I ran was called smoking
- 3 issues.
- 4 Q. So would it be fair to say that from 1993 to the
- 5 beginning of 1996, you were responsible for a group
- 6 called smoking issues at BATCO?
- 7 A. Yes, I was the head of smoking issues.
- 8 Q. And what were your responsibilities as head of
- 9 smoking issues department at BATCO?
- 10 A. Very similar to -- to the ones that I hold now
- 11 and in terms of evaluating the scientific literature
- 12 in relation to smoking and health and also providing
- 13 really consistent advice to the company to ensure
- 14 that public statements in relation to smoking and
- 15 health are -- are given in an accurate manner.
- 16 Q. Do you have any employees under your control
- 17 today?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. How many?
- 20 A. Let me count them on my fingers. Sorry. I
- 21 have -- I have three people who are a non-office
- 22 administrator, so, I mean, they're professional
- 23 staff, and I have two office administrators that do
- 24 part-time work.
- 25 Q. All right. Who are the three professional staff

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 that you have responsibility for?
- 2 A. There's a gentleman called Mr. Keith Gretton.
- 3 There's a -- a Anna-Lisa Westergren, who is a
- 4 scientist, and there is a Vickie Curtis, who is also
- 5 a scientist.
- 6 Q. And what are Mr. Gretton's areas of
- 7 responsibility?
- 8 A. Mr. Gretton assists in communication on
- 9 scientific matters. He's a nonscientist, but he's --
- 10 he's been involved in attempts to try and find ways
- 11 to express the scien -- the complex scientific
- 12 matters related to smoking and health in a manner
- 13 which are understandable by the layperson.
- 14 Q. All right. And Ms. West -- I -- Westergren?
- 15 A. Westergren, yes.
- 16 Q. What is her background?
- 17 A. She is a -- a pharmacologist who has -- who
- 18 worked -- this is her first job. She's worked now
- 19 with the company for about a year, and she assists me
- 20 particularly in -- in ensuring that the Scientific
- 21 Research Group and the various scientists involved in
- 22 our independent research are provided with any
- 23 support that they wish.
- 24 Q. And how about Ms. Curtis? What's her
- 25 educational background?

- 1 A. She is with a molecular biological background
- 2 and she does a lot of work again trying to -- to pull
- 3 together the scientific literature, particularly
- 4 related to molecular biology, and again also speaks
- 5 with independent scientists to try and understand
- 6 advances in that science.
- 7 Q. You said she has a medical biological
- 8 background. Is she --
- 9 A. I'm sorry, molecular biological.
- 10 Q. Oh, I'm sorry. She's not a doctor?
- 11 A. No. She's -- no, she's not.
- 12 Q. BATCO doesn't have any doctors on staff, does
- 13 it?
- 14 A. A physician?
- 15 Q. Physicians.
- 16 A. No, not that I'm aware of.
- 17 Q. And in fact, the entire time you've been with
- 18 BATCO, BATCO has never had any physicians on its
- 19 staff, has it?
- 20 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- 21 Q. And in fact, thinking back over what you know
- 22 about BATCO, BATCO has never had any physicians on
- 23 its staff, has it?
- 24 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- 25 Q. And your background is not a --

- 1 And you are not a physician, are you?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. What's your background, sir?
- 4 A. My -- my background is in physical chemistry.
- 5 My Ph.D. was in mass spectrometry, and then I did
- 6 postdoctoral research at Cornell University in -- in
- 7 New York state looking at techniques whereby we could
- 8 identify biological materials working with New York
- 9 University using the technique of mass spectrometry.
- 10 I then did a further postdoctoral research looking at
- 11 detecting environmental exposures using various
- 12 techniques.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, you understand that you are here today
- 14 because we served a deposition notice on B.A.T.
- 15 Industries and BATCO; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 18 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 584, have you seen this document
- 19 before?
- 20 A. Yes, I have seen this before.
- 21 Q. All right. This is the deposition notice for
- 22 the deposition that you've agreed to be the
- 23 spokesperson here today for; right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. All right. Now, you read it over?

- 1 A. Can I just take a second and reread it just to
- 2 make sure I'm --
- 3 Q. Well have you read it before?
- 4 A. I've -- I've read it very briefly before.
- 5 Q. You understand that there are eight topics
- 6 listed on the second page of this Exhibit 584;
- 7 right?
- 8 A. Yes, I see eight topics listed.
- 9 Q. All right. And do you understand that we have
- 10 already taken the deposition of B.A.T. Industries and
- 11 BATCO on point number six?
- 12 A. I didn't know that before, but I heard your
- 13 previous statement on that.
- 14 Q. All right. Now, sir, do you understand that the
- 15 deposition we're taking here today is pursuant to
- 16 Rule 30.02(f) of the Minnesota Rules of Civil
- 17 Procedure?
- 18 A. I've been explained what that means and I think
- 19 I pretty much understand what it means.
- 20 Q. All right. Do you understand that Exhibit 584
- 21 requires B.A.T. Industries and BATCO to produce a
- 22 person qualified to testify as to matters known or
- 23 reasonably known to them concerning the subjects in
- 24 this deposition notice?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the extent it
- 2 calls for a legal conclusion.
- 3 Q. Well you understand that this deposition notice
- 4 is to a corporation -- to the two corporations,
- 5 B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. and BATCO; right?
- 6 A. That's my understanding.
- 7 Q. All right. Do you understand that you have been
- 8 designated as a corporate representative of those two
- 9 corporations to speak on their behalf at this
- 10 deposition?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form. Go
- 12 ahead.
- 13 A. Yeah, that's what I understand.
- 14 Q. All right. And you understand that at this
- 15 deposition you are speaking for both BATCO and B.A.T.
- 16 Industries; right?
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form. You
- 18 may answer.
- 19 A. That's what I understand.
- 20 Q. All right. And you've consented to speak for
- 21 those two corporations at this deposition today?
- 22 A. Yes, I have.
- 23 Q. Now you understand that your testimony here
- 24 today is binding on B.A.T. Industries and BATCO?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.

- 1 MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Yeah, objection to the form
- 3 to the extent it calls for some kind of legal
- 4 conclusion.
- 5 A. I'm not sure what it means by "binding."
- 6 Q. Well --
- 7 A. I mean, what I -- what I'm certainly here today
- 8 is to provide you with as much help as possible from
- 9 my knowledge.
- 10 Q. Okay. And also the knowledge of the two
- 11 corporations; right?
- 12 A. Yeah, to the extent that I know it, and I think
- 13 I know it fairly well.
- 14 Q. All right. And you have authority to speak on
- 15 behalf of B.A.T. Industries and BATCO, don't you?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form to the
- 17 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
- 18 A. Am I supposed to answer? I guess the answer is
- 19 probably yes.
- 20 Q. Okay. And so it would be fair to say that for
- 21 this deposition you're B.A.T. Industries' and BATCO's
- 22 spokesperson; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 25 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)

- 1 A. Yes, I guess so.
- 2 Q. All right. And you're here today acting as
- 3 B.A.T. Industries' spokesperson; right?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form. Can
- 5 I -- can we have a clarification? One objection is
- 6 for all?
- 7 MS. WIVELL: Yeah.
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Okay. Objection to the
- 9 form. Do you remember the question?
- 10 THE WITNESS: No, I'm sorry. Could you --
- 11 MS. WIVELL: All right.
- 12 THE WITNESS: -- repeat the question?
- MS. WIVELL: Certainly.
- 14 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 15 Q. You're here today acting as B.A.T. Industries'
- 16 spokesperson; right?
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 18 A. I'm -- I'm here today to -- to represent as much
- 19 as I can my knowledge of -- of -- of what
- 20 British-American Tobacco Company's views are and
- 21 B.A.T. Industries'.
- 22 Q. Okay. And do you understand that the answers
- 23 which you give in the depositions to the questions I
- 24 ask must be as -- answered fully, based not only on
- 25 what you know but also information available to

- 1 B.A.T. Industries and BATCO?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 3 A. I mean, I will answer the questions obviously to
- 4 the best of my ability.
- 5 Q. Okay. Well let me ask it this way: What
- 6 preparation did you do to get ready for this
- 7 deposition today so that you could act as
- 8 spokesperson for these two corporations?
- 9 A. Well, I mean, during the period from 1993
- 10 through to 1990 -- well until to the present day,
- 11 I've obviously been very significantly involved in
- 12 the public positions that British-American Tobacco
- 13 Company and -- and since B.A.T. Industries defers to
- 14 British-American Tobacco Company Limited on these
- 15 types of issues, really to both of those parties.
- 16 During that period I've obviously looked at a variety
- 17 of things that the company has done in terms of its
- 18 research and also its public statements.
- 19 In terms of specific preparation, it's really
- 20 quite limited. I -- I came over to New York and have
- 21 spent the last couple of days trying to prepare
- 22 through the -- the various materials that you
- 23 submitted.
- 24 Q. All right. When did you first see Exhibit 584?
- 25 A. Which is this document?

- 1 Q. Yes.
- 2 A. I quess on Friday morning.
- 3 Q. All right. Did you ask counsel to provide you
- 4 with information about the topics listed in
- 5 Exhibit 584 so you could prepare for the deposition?
- 6 A. No. I felt that I -- I had fairly good
- 7 knowledge on -- on the topics, certainly one through
- 8 five. I mean, I was advised that it was unlikely
- 9 that we would talk about topics six, seven and
- 10 eight. I do have some knowledge on that, but not
- 11 extensive, and I certainly haven't done any
- 12 additional preparation on topics seven and eight.
- 13 Q. All right.
- 14 A. I really have little knowledge on six, but so, I
- 15 mean, to the best of my ability, I think on topics
- 16 one through five they are areas that I was familiar
- 17 with before starting to prepare for this deposition.
- 18 Q. Do you understand that the answers you give
- 19 today in this deposition are to be based not only on
- 20 what you know personally but also what you learned in
- 21 preparation for this deposition?
- 22 A. Yeah.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 24 A. I mean, again I will -- I will answer questions
- 25 to the best of my ability and -- and to whatever

- 1 knowledge I have.
- 2 Q. Is there anyone else who's better qualified than
- 3 you to testify about the subjects in Exhibit 584?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 5 A. If you mean as an employee of British-American
- 6 Tobacco Company Limited, then given the breadth of
- 7 the information that you require, I would say I'm the
- 8 best person.
- 9 Q. Okay. Did you talk to any other company
- 10 employees in preparation for this deposition?
- 11 A. I had about a ten-minute telephone conversation
- 12 with Martyn Gilbey, who -- who told me pretty much
- 13 what it was likely to be like, but other than that,
- 14 I've had no other discussions with people with inside
- 15 the company.
- 16 Q. Is it a matter of concern to BATCO that
- 17 cigarettes have been suspected of being a cause of
- 18 serious disease to the people who smoke them?
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 20 A. Is it a matter of concern? I guess the answer
- 21 is yes. Clearly British-American Tobacco Company
- 22 Limited have right from the early days of -- of
- 23 scientific research that have found associations
- 24 between smoking and various diseases taken that
- 25 research very seriously and undertaken, I believe, a

- 1 series of certainly research efforts and funding of
- 2 independent research to try and contribute to
- 3 people's understanding of these matters.
- 4 Q. Is it a matter of serious concern to B.A.T.
- 5 Industries that the cigarettes which its companies,
- 6 its subsidiaries, sell have been alleged to be a
- 7 serious cause of disease?
- 8 MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 9 A. I mean, British -- B.A.T. Industries takes its
- 10 advice from British-American Tobacco Company Limited
- 11 on these issues, and I would assume that B.A.T.
- 12 Industries and British-American Tobacco have clearly
- 13 looked at the scientific literature related to
- 14 smoking and health and -- and clearly are -- I don't
- 15 know whether the word is "concerned," but certainly
- 16 highly involved in the research as it's developed and
- 17 an attempt to ensure that we act in a -- in a very
- 18 responsible manner.
- 19 Q. All right, sir. Would you agree that in the
- 20 context of smoking and health, that BATCO has an
- 21 overriding responsibility towards smokers?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to form to the
- 23 extent it may call for a legal conclusion.
- 24 A. Your question asked about an overriding --
- 25 Q. Responsibility.

- 1 A. I'm sorry, could you repeat for me?
- 2 Q. Certainly. Would you agree that in the context
- 3 of smoking and health, BATCO has an overriding
- 4 responsibility to smokers?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 6 A. I mean, my view is that British-American Tobacco
- 7 Company Limited has -- has looked at the research and
- 8 has ensured -- has acted responsibly throughout many,
- 9 many decades. What is clearly the case is that
- 10 public health authorities have provided advice as to
- 11 their views on smoking and health. I think we have
- 12 been very responsible in that frankly a smoker where
- 13 I come from, the United Kingdom, his views on the
- 14 smoking-and-health issue would be taken I think
- 15 entirely from the views of the public health
- 16 authorities.
- 17 What we have -- have done in terms of a matter
- 18 of practice is that we have continued significant
- 19 independent research, but we have not made
- 20 significant public statements which -- which would --
- 21 I mean, which would to the -- the person in the
- 22 street, smoker or nonsmoker, give them I think
- 23 probably significant alternative views to the ones
- 24 that they receive from the public health
- 25 authorities.

- 1 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 2 question is simply about BATCO, not about any public
- 3 health authorities, and I think that we'll probably
- 4 get along a little better in this deposition if you
- 5 understand I'm not looking for information that the
- 6 public health authorities may have provided. I'm
- 7 asking for BATCO's information, and I'm going to be
- 8 asking for B.A.T. Industries' information, so I'm
- 9 going to move to strike as nonresponsive.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Move to strike counsel's
- 11 statements.
- 12 Q. Sir, my question is this: Does BATCO believe
- 13 that in the context of smoking and health it has an
- 14 overriding responsibility to the smoker; "yes" or
- 15 "no"?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: The question was asked and
- 17 answered, and the witness can answer it in any way he
- 18 sees fit to properly answer the question.
- 19 A. Yeah, and I'm -- and I'm sorry and I -- I would
- 20 like to get along in this deposition, but, I mean,
- 21 the fact is if you -- if you look at, for example,
- 22 the United Kingdom, the public's information on these
- 23 matters come from the public health authorities. For
- 24 British-American Tobacco Company Limited, the key
- 25 thing is -- is that we give respect to those public

- 1 health authorities, and so we have not done anything
- 2 in terms of what the public may understand on these
- 3 matters which -- which would veer away from them.
- 4 So at the end of the day -- and I hope I'm being
- 5 responsive to your question. At the end of the day
- 6 what is clearly mattered is what smokers have
- 7 understood about these matters, and what they've
- 8 understood has most clearly come from the public
- 9 health authorities.
- 10 Q. Well are you saying that BATCO doesn't believe
- 11 it has a responsibility to smokers?
- 12 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection,
- 13 mischaracterization of the testimony.
- 14 A. I don't think that's what I said. What I was
- 15 trying to explain was that in the real environment, I
- 16 mean, a smoker will make its decision or a person
- 17 will make its decision whether to smoke or not on the
- 18 basis of information provided to them, and
- 19 overwhelmingly that information has been that of --
- 20 of -- of the government, from the public health
- 21 authorities and from physicians.
- 22 Q. Sir, I'm going to move to strike as
- 23 nonresponsive. My question didn't have anything to
- 24 do with the decision about how a person smokes. My
- 25 question has to do with does BATCO recognize it has a

- 1 responsibility to smokers.
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to counsel's
- 3 statements. They're inappropriate. And objecting to
- 4 the question as asked and answered. You may answer
- 5 again.
- 6 A. I mean, British-American Tobacco, I mean,
- 7 clearly understands that -- that there are issues
- 8 related to smoking and health and it feels
- 9 responsible most certainly to investing in -- in
- 10 significant research to obtain a greater
- 11 understanding. As a responsible company, I think
- 12 what you will see from our history over -- over
- 13 decades is that we have given respect to what public
- 14 health authorities have -- have said on these
- 15 matters.
- So I mean, there is a set of -- of -- of actions
- 17 that British-American Tobacco Company have taken in
- 18 terms of researching the issues in-house and -- and
- 19 externally and trying to understand the science as
- 20 much as -- as is possible, but the fact is for -- for
- 21 a smoker or someone who chooses to smoke, it is -- it
- 22 is the statements of public health authorities, of
- 23 governments, of -- of individual physicians that they
- 24 have taken notice of in terms of their choice of
- 25 whether to smoke or not.

- 1 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- MS. WIVELL: Would you please mark that,
- 3 sir.
- 4 The court reporter will give you that.
- 5 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Marti, if you could just
- 7 kind of throw it over a little bit farther, it's a
- 8 big table and I don't want to keep interrupting by
- 9 getting up to get to documents, so if you just throw
- 10 it over a little bit more, it will work better.
- 11 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)
- 12 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 585 was marked
- for identification.)
- 14 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 15 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 16 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 585, it's Bates numbered
- 17 100428118; correct?
- 18 A. Oh, sorry. I've found where that number is.
- 19 It's 100428118. That's the Bates number in the
- 20 corner.
- 21 Q. All right. And it's entitled "ITEM 4 (f),"
- 22 BATCO COMPANY "DIVISION, THE USE OF ANIMALS IN
- 23 RESEARCH PROGRAMMES"; correct?
- 24 A. The title here says "ITEM 4," in parentheses
- 25 "(f), B.A.T. TOBACCO DIVISION, THE USE OF ANIMALS IN

- 1 RESEARCH PROGRAMMES."
- 2 Q. And it says --
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to the use of this
- 4 document. It wasn't one of the almost 500 documents
- 5 that were predesignated for the use of this
- 6 deposition, and therefore I find it -- it completely
- 7 objectionable to question the witness upon the
- 8 document at this time.
- 9 MS. WIVELL: Well I believe you're
- 10 incorrect.
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Well if you could show me
- 12 where it was predesignated, I'll withdraw my
- 13 designation, but it's not on a predesignation list
- 14 that you supplied to us.
- 15 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 16 Q. Sir, looking at the first --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Maybe --
- 18 MS. WIVELL: I'm sorry, I would like to go
- 19 on --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well excuse me.
- 21 MS. WIVELL: -- if you don't mind
- 22 interrupting.
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: If you would -- if you would
- 24 show me where it is on the predesignated list, I will
- 25 withdraw my objection.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: You have the list in front of
- 2 you, don't you?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: I do, and I just checked it
- 4 and it's not on it.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: And it's not on the
- 6 supplemental list?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: And it's not on the
- 8 supplemental list.
- 9 MS. WIVELL: I believe it's on the
- 10 supplemental list, but I do believe it's designated.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well it's not on the
- 12 supplemental list that was dated and sent to us at
- 13 the end of business on August 8th, 1997. It's not on
- 14 our list.
- MS. WIVELL: Well I believe it is, and even
- 16 if --
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Well we -- we can mark
- 18 the -- we can mark the list if you would like as an
- 19 exhibit --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me.
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: -- but it's not on the list.
- 22 MS. WIVELL: I know that you're not used to
- 23 practicing in the Minnesota litigation, but we do
- 24 have a rule that counsel will not interrupt when
- 25 another --

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Well I'm sorry, I wasn't
- 2 interrupting you. I think you were interrupting me.
- 3 My point is and my objection is that you've
- 4 designated, predesignated for this deposition, almost
- 5 500 documents. The first exhibit that you're going
- 6 to use from B.A.T. files is a document that's not on
- 7 either of the 500 document designation lists.
- 8 MS. WIVELL: Well --
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: It's my understanding --
- 10 even though you're correct I haven't been involved in
- 11 many of the depositions, but it's my understanding
- 12 after looking at the court's orders that the
- 13 documents to be used at the designation are to be
- 14 predesignated. This is not on either predesignation
- 15 list, unless you have some supplemental list that you
- 16 haven't disclosed to us. It's not on the list you've
- 17 given us, and I object to the use of it.
- MS. WIVELL: Well, first of all, I'm
- 19 allowed to use for impeachment documents which aren't
- 20 on the list, but I believe it's on the list and I'm
- 21 not going to take time out right now to go through
- 22 and point it out to you. I would like to go on with
- 23 the examination.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Fine. I would like to have
- 25 marked for exhibits next in order the --

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Fine, you can do that during
- 2 your portion of the -- of the examination. We're
- 3 going to go on now.
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Under the rules of
- 5 Minnesota, I believe it's my right to have exhibits
- 6 marked at the time in which they arise. I would like
- 7 to have marked next in order the exhibits, the
- 8 predesignation list, both supplemental and the list
- 9 of August 5, 1997.
- 10 MS. WIVELL: You can do that at the time of
- 11 your testimony. We're going to go on.
- MR. SHEFFLER: We're going to mark them
- 13 now.
- 14 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 15 Q. Sir, point one says "In the context of smoking
- 16 and health the cigarette manufacturer has an
- 17 overriding responsibility towards smokers"; correct?
- 18 A. That's what it says here, yeah.
- 19 Q. All right. Do you agree with that, sir? Does
- 20 BATCO have in the context of smoking and health an
- 21 overriding responsibility towards smokers?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Continued objection to the
- 23 use of the document.
- 24 A. I mean, it's my view that British-American
- 25 Tobacco Company is responsible for research into

- 1 smoking and health, and as part of the general
- 2 contribution within not only the company but also
- 3 externally in the -- in the academic environment, we
- 4 should be undertaking research in relation to smoking
- 5 and health. I think that's exactly what we have done
- 6 for many years.
- 7 Q. And so you're agreeing that BATCO does have an
- 8 overriding responsibility --
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. -- towards smokers?
- 11 A. I don't --
- 12 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Doctor, please
- 13 just when she finishes her question, let her finish
- 14 her question entirely.
- THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Let me get an objection in
- 17 when a question is objectionable, and then you
- 18 answer, and she won't interrupt you either.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry.
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: And my objection is to the
- 21 form of the question and the fact that it was asked
- 22 and answered. You may answer again.
- 23 A. I don't believe that my answer said yes to
- 24 there's an overriding responsibility. What -- what I
- 25 tried to say in response to your question, that

- 1 issues related to smoking and health are -- are
- 2 broadly based. I do agree that British-American
- 3 Tobacco Company Limited and -- should and -- and in
- 4 fact it has done research in relation to smoking and
- 5 health throughout decades. That's a part of a
- 6 general contribution of -- of scientific knowledge,
- 7 trying to understand the science related to smoking
- 8 and health.
- 9 Q. Move to strike the nonresponsive portions. Let
- 10 me ask you this, sir: Do you agree that a
- 11 responsible cigarette manufacturer should understand
- 12 the health allegations against the cigarettes it
- 13 makes?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 15 A. Yes, I should say we should understand the
- 16 science. I'm not sure about the allegations, but we
- 17 should certainly understand the science.
- 18 Q. All right. Would you agree that it's the
- 19 responsibility of a responsible cigarette --
- 20 cigarette manufacturer to obtain as much knowledge as
- 21 possible about its cigarettes and their effect on
- 22 smokers?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I don't know whether it's a responsibility.
- 25 It's clearly been a fact that we have attempted

- 1 through a significant amount of research and the --
- 2 both internally and the funding of external research
- 3 to understand as much as -- as possible about
- 4 cigarette smoke and its possible effects on human
- 5 health.
- 6 Q. You would agree that it's the responsibility of
- 7 a cigarette manufacturer to keep in the forefront of
- 8 knowledge about its products; right?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 10 A. And again, I mean, I'm not sure what the term
- 11 "responsibility" means, but certainly the company
- 12 has for many years attempted to ensure that it
- 13 understands as much as possible about its own
- 14 product. That's why we've undertaken research for
- 15 many years.
- 16 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 586 was marked
- for identification.)
- 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 21 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 586, this is a document that
- 22 begins with Bates number 500006558; correct?
- 23 A. Yes, it's 500006558.
- 24 Q. All right. And it's entitled "SMOKING AND
- 25 HEALTH, STRATEGIES AND CONSTRAINTS"; right?

- 1 A. It has one title, "SMOKING AND HEALTH," and
- 2 underneath it says "STRATEGIES AND CONSTRAINTS."
- 3 Q. Would you please turn to the second page of the
- 4 document and look at the last sentence on that page.
- 5 There it says "To be effective we must be seen to be
- 6 responsible and, within our field, authoritative."
- 7 Do you see that, sir?
- 8 A. Yes, it -- it says that at the bottom of page --
- 9 it says three on -- on my copy.
- 10 Q. All right. And you would agree that in order to
- 11 be effective as a cigarette manufacturer, BATCO
- 12 needed to be responsible within its field; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to form.
- MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 15 A. Again, I mean, we've -- we've discussed this
- 16 question and again it depends on -- on what you mean
- 17 by "responsible." I believe that British-American
- 18 Tobacco certainly should have undertaken research in
- 19 relation to smoking and health, and I believe that is
- 20 exactly what British-American Tobacco has done.
- 21 Q. Now, sir, could you turn to the --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Are you finished with your
- 23 answer? Are you finished with your answer?
- 24 THE WITNESS: I think I had actually.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Okay.

- 1 Q. Could you turn to the page that ends with Bates
- 2 number 563.
- 3 A. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm not very familiar with Bates
- 4 numbers. It's sequential pages?
- 5 Q. Yes, sir. Do you have it?
- 6 A. I have one which says -- yeah, which is page
- 7 seven on the -- the bottom of this document as far as
- 8 I can see.
- 9 Q. It says at the top of that page "For the
- 10 research role to be effective it is necessary to keep
- 11 in the forefront of knowledge across a wide area not
- 12 only of products and laboratory testing but also of
- 13 the reaction of smokers to "prod -- "products new and
- 14 old and of factors which influence their smoking
- 15 behaviour"; correct?
- 16 A. That's what it states in this document, yes.
- 17 Q. All right. And, sir, isn't it true that a
- 18 responsible manufacturer of cigarettes would do
- 19 research to keep in the forefront of knowledge about
- 20 their products?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, also
- 22 asked and answered. Go ahead.
- 23 A. I mean, I think what -- what the statement that
- 24 you've -- you've pulled out of this document, which
- 25 goes on quite a few pages and I haven't had a chance

- 1 to review, but I mean, I think what the -- the -- the
- 2 essence of -- of that is that one should have an
- 3 understanding of the scientific knowledge. Now that
- 4 knowledge may be acquired from science being
- 5 undertaken, for example, by the National Cancer
- 6 Institute in the United States or whatever, and I
- 7 think there is a -- a requirement of some fashion.
- 8 I'm not sure exactly how you would frame that
- 9 requirement, but there's a requirement to understand
- 10 scientific developments to the best of our ability.
- 11 I think that's what British-American Tobacco Company
- 12 has done.
- 13 Q. All right. Is it also a responsibility of
- 14 B.A.T. Industries to make sure that its companies
- 15 that sell cigarettes to the public keep in the
- 16 forefront of knowledge about hazards associated with
- 17 their product?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Objection to the
- 19 form.
- 20 A. I think B.A.T. Industries obviously has an
- 21 interest in exactly how its tobacco operations
- 22 operate in terms of their understanding of the -- the
- 23 science of smoking and health, and they would keep
- 24 a -- perhaps you could call it a watching brief. I
- 25 mean, it's a responsibility of British-American

- 1 Tobacco Company Limited to -- again I think
- 2 "responsibility" is a term I'm not quite sure is
- 3 easy to define, but it's certainly what
- 4 British-American Tobacco Company does, is to try and
- 5 understand the science of smoking and health and to
- 6 fund research and to undertake research internally.
- 7 Q. All right. Well again I'm focusing on -- in
- 8 this question about B.A.T. Industries, and is it
- 9 incumbent upon them as a company that has
- 10 subsidiaries which are selling cigarettes to the
- 11 public to be responsible and understand the
- 12 allegations associated with the products that their
- 13 companies are selling?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 15 A. I'm not sure what "incumbent" means, but let --
- 16 let me try and answer your question in the $\operatorname{--}$ in a
- 17 proper way.
- 18 I think the fact is that British-American
- 19 Tobacco Company has for many years been responsibly
- 20 looking at the smoking-and-health data, and I think
- 21 that the fact is that B.A.T. Industries and -- rely
- 22 upon British-American Tobacco Company to do that
- 23 work. I would -- I think that because that effort
- 24 has been responsible and certainly B.A.T. Industries
- 25 would have been informed of that type of -- of effort

- 1 and presumably are comfortable -- are comfortable,
- 2 sorry.
- 3 Q. Now would you agree that for BATCO to be
- 4 knowledgable about its products it would have to keep
- 5 in the forefront of what's happening with regard to
- 6 cigarette research throughout the world?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Well objection to the form.
- 8 Go ahead.
- 9 A. I mean, it depends very much what you mean
- 10 "forefront." I mean, should -- because if you look
- 11 at research related to smoking and health, it will
- 12 cover an enormous breadth of area from these days
- 13 extremely complex molecular biology. I think it's --
- 14 it's -- what British-American Tobacco has done, it's
- 15 ensured that it has a broad breadth of knowledge in
- 16 relation to that smoking-and-health research and has
- 17 been funding independent research into the various
- 18 areas that have gone forward on smoking and health.
- 19 Q. Well, sir, this document at page 563 talks about
- 20 "For the research role to be effective it is
- 21 necessary to keep in the forefront of knowledge
- 22 across a wide area not only of products and
- 23 laboratory testing but also ... the reaction of
- 24 smokers ..."; correct?
- 25 A. Yes, it does. It goes on.

- 1 Q. All right. Do you agree with that statement?
- 2 A. I mean, I think that statement is en -- entirely
- 3 consistent with what I've -- I've been explaining of
- 4 British-American Tobacco Company's behavior, is that
- 5 we attempt and in part it's my responsibility to
- 6 understand scientific developments in relation to
- 7 smoking and health, to fund independent research into
- 8 matters related to smoking and health. And I think,
- 9 I mean, the term "forefront" is -- and I'm not sure
- 10 how that is properly defined or what the intention
- 11 was when someone wrote this document in -- when was
- 12 it? -- 1975, but my understanding is that to keep in
- 13 the forefront you can do that certainly by reviewing
- 14 scientific literature. And where there are areas of
- 15 research that have been undertaken outside the
- 16 company, I think it's entirely sufficient for us
- 17 to -- to have an understanding of that research
- 18 area.
- 19 Q. So you would agree that essentially what's
- 20 written here in Exhibit 586 is essentially what BATCO
- 21 recognizes its responsibilities to be today; right?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 23 question. You've only read two paragraphs of 586.
- 24 A. And -- and that was going to be my response. I
- 25 mean, but --

- 1 Q. What a surprise.
- 2 A. -- I mean, in terms of -- in terms of, I mean,
- 3 the paragraph that you -- you read here on -- on
- 4 50006563, what I've said is that I think it is
- 5 generally consistent with -- with my view of where
- 6 British-American Tobacco has undertaken its -- its
- 7 area, and obviously, I mean, taking one paragraph out
- 8 of this, as I said, I-don't-know-how-many-page
- 9 document, I would have to read everything in detail
- 10 to give you some advice as to whether the whole thing
- 11 is -- is consistent with where I believe
- 12 British-American Tobacco Company is.
- 13 Q. And has B.A.T. Industries delegated to BATCO the
- 14 responsibility to keep in the forefront, as it says
- 15 here?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 17 A. I mean, B.A.T. Industries is aware that
- 18 British-American Tobacco Company Limited undertakes
- 19 independent research and undertakes to understand
- 20 the -- the smoking-and-health issue as much as
- 21 possible. They're informed of that matter. So
- 22 I'm -- I'm actually twittering on the end. I
- 23 didn't -- I forgot your actual question, if you could
- 24 repeat it.
- 25 Q. Let me rephrase it.

- 1 Has B.A.T. Industries delegated to BATCO the
- 2 responsibility to -- to keep up with the knowledge of
- 3 smoking-and-health issues?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 6 A. Let me answer -- sorry. Let me answer that.
- 7 I think, I mean, it's not a case of formal
- 8 delegation, and what has clearly happened is that
- 9 British-American Tobacco Company does look at the
- 10 smoking-and-health science. We have people like
- 11 myself that are responsible for doing that. On
- 12 occasions for information, presentations are given to
- 13 B.A.T. Industries to give them a broad understanding
- 14 of where the scientific arena is developing, but it's
- 15 the responsibility of British-American Tobacco
- 16 Company to have the detailed understanding and to
- 17 undertake the research in relation to smoking and
- 18 health.
- MR. SHEFFLER: We've been going a little
- 20 bit over an hour. If this is a convenient time to
- 21 break, let's take a break.
- MS. WIVELL: Fine.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 24 (Recess taken.)
- 25 BY MS. WIVELL:

- 1 Q. Sir, does BATCO see itself as a responsible
- 2 company?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I believe that British-American Tobacco is a
- 5 responsible company, yes.
- 6 Q. All right. Does BATCO see itself as an ethical
- 7 company?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Does B.A.T. Industries see itself as a
- 11 responsible company?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Does B.A.T. Industries see itself as an ethical
- 15 company?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Are they companies, BATCO and B.A.T. Industries,
- 19 that wanted to understand their products?
- 20 A. I mean, British-American Tobacco Company
- 21 Limited --
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to the form.
- 23 A. -- if you're talking about tobacco products,
- 24 has -- has wanted to understand its products,
- 25 absolutely.

- 1 Q. All right. And does B.A.T. Industries want to
- 2 understand the tobacco products of the -- made by the
- 3 companies, its subsidiaries, which sell cigarettes?
- 4 A. I mean, British-American Tobacco Company Limited
- 5 is -- does do the research in relation to smoking and
- 6 health. I think B.A.T. Industries, to respond to
- 7 your question, gets information from British-American
- 8 Tobacco Company Limited and is -- is satisfied that
- 9 British-American Tobacco Company Limited is being
- 10 responsible in these matters.
- 11 Q. All right. And does B.A.T. Industries also
- 12 assure itself that Brown & Williamson is being
- 13 responsible when it comes to these issues?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 15 A. The research related to smoking and health --
- 16 are you okay?
- 17 O. Yeah.
- 18 A. Research in relation to smoking and health is --
- 19 is the responsibility of the tobacco companies, and,
- 20 you know, in terms of Brown & Williamson, I'm
- 21 obviously here responding for British-American
- 22 Tobacco Company Limited, but in terms of the
- 23 fundamental effort in relation to -- to -- to smoking
- 24 and health, I mean, I think I can speak for us being
- 25 responsible and I believe we have.

- 1 Q. All right. But you're also here as a
- 2 spokesperson for B.A.T. Industries, and so I'm going
- 3 to re-ask my question again.
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the statements of
- 5 counsel.
- 6 Q. Does B.A.T. Industries also assure itself that
- 7 Brown & Williamson is being responsible when it comes
- 8 to issues relating to smoking and health?
- 9 A. And again, I mean, I'll try and respond to that
- 10 on -- for B.A.T. Industries' point of view, that
- 11 they -- they take a look and get information in
- 12 relation to the -- the actions of the various
- 13 operating companies, and I believe they -- they are
- 14 of the understanding that those companies have been
- 15 taking appropriate actions.
- MS. WIVELL: Could you get out Exhibit 492,
- 17 Mr. LaBorde.
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Off the record.
- 19 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)
- 20 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 492 was handed
- 21 to the witness.)
- 22 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 23 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked previously
- 24 as Exhibit 492, could you turn to the page that is
- 25 Bates numbered 800. There the second complete

- 1 paragraph begins "As a responsible company BAT wishes
- 2 to fully understand its product. Fundamental work
- 3 within Biological Research, often in collaboration
- 4 with other areas, increases our understanding of what
- 5 factors influence the biological activity of smoke.
- 6 This ensures that the Company is seen to be ethical
- 7 in its approach and in a strong position when testing
- 8 new products."
- 9 Have I read that correctly so far?
- 10 A. Yes, you've read that correctly.
- 11 Q. Do you understand that that paragraph states the
- 12 position of BATCO when it comes today to the reason
- 13 it is doing research?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 15 A. Well the reason that, I mean, British-American
- 16 Tobacco Company Limited today does research is to
- 17 understand the product and to advance scientific
- 18 knowledge in relation to smoking and health, and
- 19 that's research that's done internally in the company
- 20 and also externally from the company and -- and
- 21 really overviewing what scientific advances are made
- 22 in the general academic environment.
- 23 Q. So you would agree with that portion of what's
- 24 been marked as Exhibit 492 that we just read; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.

- 1 A. I mean, my answer was that -- I mean, and your
- 2 question was related to what British-American Tobacco
- 3 does. It -- it -- it undertakes research to
- 4 understand issues related to smoking and health, and
- 5 that's research that is included in-house research as
- 6 well as external research as well as looking at -- at
- 7 what, for example, various National Instit -- Cancer
- 8 Institutes may be undertaking in terms of their
- 9 research.
- 10 Q. But you would agree that B.A.T. recognizes that
- 11 it has a responsibility to have scientific and
- 12 technical knowledge about its cigarettes; right?
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 14 A. I mean, in terms of British-American Tobacco
- 15 Company Limited, clearly the fact is that we've had a
- 16 research establishment for many years that's been
- 17 undertaking research and that we've had people that
- 18 have been looking at the external literature in
- 19 relation to smoking and health and have, for example,
- 20 been contributing to joint programs; for example, in
- 21 the United Kingdom with -- with the government
- 22 looking at these types of matters.
- 23 Q. So you would agree that B.A.T. does recognize it
- 24 has a responsibility to have scientific knowledge
- 25 about its cigarettes; right?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 2 answered.
- 3 A. I mean, again I think the response is as -- as
- 4 previously and that the fact is that British-American
- 5 Tobacco has undertaken a significant amount of
- 6 research both internally and externally in relation
- 7 to smoking and health, smoking -- smoke chemistry, a
- 8 whole variety of areas of research that might be
- 9 related to smoking and health.
- 10 Q. Well my question -- I'm going to move to strike
- 11 as nonresponsive. My question's a bit different,
- 12 sir.
- 13 Does BATCO recognize that it has a
- 14 responsibility to develop scientific knowledge about
- 15 its cigarettes?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This was
- 17 repeatedly asked and answered.
- 18 A. And -- and my answer is that, I mean,
- 19 British-American Tobacco has undertaken a significant
- 20 amount of research in-house and -- and -- and
- 21 externally, and I mean, if -- that I think responds
- 22 to the question, and the fact is that we have clearly
- 23 been undertaking this type of research and evaluating
- 24 what research has been undertaken in the external
- 25 environment.

- 1 Q. Well move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 2 question's a little bit different.
- 3 Did you undertake this research because you
- 4 recognized you had a responsibility to develop
- 5 scientific knowledge about the cigarettes you were
- 6 selling?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 8 objection to asked and answered repeatedly.
- 9 A. I mean, the fact that we've undertaken research
- 10 internally and -- and funded research externally
- 11 would lead me to the opinion that -- that clearly
- 12 this is something that we felt we needed to do, yes.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, you would agree that it is also
- 14 vitally important that none of the B.A.T. Group
- 15 companies mislead the consumer; --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to form.
- 17 Q. -- isn't that true?
- 18 A. I think, you know, as a responsible company,
- 19 there -- there should be no intention to mislead a
- 20 consumer in any way, and I believe that, as far as I
- 21 can see from the behavior of British-American Tobacco
- 22 Company, that has not been done.
- 23 Q. Well move to strike the nonresponsive portion of
- 24 the answer.
- 25 Sir, my question is simply this: Do you agree,

- 1 "yes" or "no," that it is imperative that BATCO not
- 2 mislead consumers?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. That question
- 4 was asked and answered.
- 5 A. And my answer is that I think as a responsible
- 6 company, there should be no intention to -- to
- 7 misspeak or mislead in any shape or form, and I
- 8 believe that is exactly what's happened.
- 9 Q. All right. And if you take a look at
- 10 Exhibit 586, that is one of the first statements on
- 11 the first page of that exhibit, isn't it, sir?
- 12 A. Can I just look back at that one?
- 13 Q. Yes. Look at the last sentence on the first
- 14 page. Do you see that sentiment listed there, sir?
- 15 A. Yeah. What it -- what it says is "In general we
- 16 should maintain our companies in the public mind as
- 17 socially useful and responsible as suppliers, as
- 18 buyers, as employers, et cetera. Above all we"
- 19 should "not mislead our consumers, who must believe
- 20 that as manufacturers we are acting responsibly."
- 21 Q. All right. And you -- you would agree with that
- 22 paragraph you just read, wouldn't you, sir?
- 23 A. I would certainly agree with the sentiment that
- 24 British-American Tobacco should and -- and I believe
- 25 is responsible.

- 1 Q. All right. Well would you agree that B.A.T.
- 2 Industries also has a responsibility not to mislead
- 3 people who smoke cigarettes manufactured by any of
- 4 their subsidiary companies?
- 5 A. I believe, and as I -- I tried to state before,
- 6 is that, I mean, British-American Tobacco Company
- 7 Limited has a responsibility for those matters you're
- 8 talking about, and B.A.T. Industries will as a matter
- 9 of information take a look at what's going on. And I
- 10 believe I'm speaking for B.A.T. Industries that they
- 11 are comfortable that the actions of the tobacco
- 12 companies has been responsible.
- 13 Q. All right. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 14 My question, sir, is this: Does B.A.T.
- 15 Industries agree it also has a responsibility not to
- 16 mislead people who smoke the cigarettes manufactured
- 17 by any of their subsidiary companies?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. That question
- 19 was asked and answered.
- 20 A. B.A.T. Industries would rely upon
- 21 British-American Tobacco Company in terms of making
- 22 statements related to consumers. B.A.T. Industries
- 23 doesn't have consumers in relation to -- to smokers;
- 24 British-American Tobacco Company has. I think
- 25 British-American -- B.A.T. Industries is informed of

- 1 the actions of British-American Tobacco Company
- 2 Limited and is happy with those actions as being
- 3 responsible.
- 4 Q. Well, sir, B.A.T. Industries from time to time
- 5 makes public statements concerning smoking and
- 6 health, doesn't it?
- 7 A. It may do so, but it would do so on the basis of
- 8 information coming from British-American Tobacco
- 9 Company Limited.
- 10 Q. And when it does so, B.A.T. Industries has a
- 11 responsibility to make sure it's not misleading
- 12 cigarette smokers in what it says about the products
- 13 that are sold by its subsidiary companies?
- 14 A. I believe that B.A.T. Industries would wish
- 15 to -- to speak as accurately as possible in that
- 16 regard. That's why they would, for example, these
- 17 days come to me to -- to provide them with
- 18 information relating to smoking and health, but it's
- 19 not simply on smoking and health. I think B.A.T.
- 20 Industries as a responsible company would wish to
- 21 speak accurately on all matters.
- 22 Q. All right. And you agree that they have a
- 23 responsibility to speak the truth when it comes to
- 24 information about smoking-and-health issues;
- 25 correct?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 2 answered repeatedly.
- 3 A. I mean, I think any company has a responsibility
- 4 of speaking the truth, and -- and that doesn't matter
- 5 whether it's matters of smoking and health or matters
- 6 of -- of any other. In relation to people's
- 7 business, people should speak the truth.
- 8 Q. And you would agree that B.A.T. Industries has
- 9 an obligation not to make untrue statements to
- 10 smokers about the cigarettes that are sold by their
- 11 subsidiary companies; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 13 answered repeatedly.
- 14 A. I mean, again, I mean, I think -- I'm not sure
- 15 whether this is a different question, but B.A.T.
- 16 Industries should speak the truth and I believe it
- 17 does speak the truth as -- as -- as on matters
- 18 related to smoking and health. That would be
- 19 something that, for example, these days I would
- 20 provide them the information on.
- 21 Q. All right. Well, it would be inappropriate for
- 22 B.A.T. Industries to make untrue statements, wouldn't
- 23 it?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 25 answered repeatedly.

- 1 A. It's appropriate -- inappropriate for any
- 2 company to -- to make untrue statements, and I think
- 3 that applies absolutely to B.A.T. Industries also.
- 4 Q. Okay. And it also applies to BATCO, doesn't
- 5 it?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Asked and answered.
- 7 A. And again as -- as it applies to every -- every
- 8 business, yes, it does.
- 9 Q. All right. And you would agree that B.A.T.
- 10 Industries should not be deceptive about what it says
- 11 to the public about smoking-and-health issues;
- 12 correct?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 14 answered.
- MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 16 A. Again I think every company, including B.A.T.
- 17 Industries, should not be misleading.
- 18 Q. All right. And that would also apply to BATCO,
- 19 wouldn't it, sir?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Asked and answered.
- 21 A. And again -- sorry.
- 22 And again, yes, every company, including
- 23 British-American Tobacco Company Limited.
- 24 Q. All right. And you would agree that it would be
- 25 improper for anyone speaking on behalf of either

- 1 B.A.T. Industries or BATCO to make statements to the
- 2 public that were misleading about cigarettes that
- 3 were manufactured by any of their group companies?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 5 A. That's a complicated question. Could you ask it
- 6 to me again.
- 7 Q. All right. Let me break it out again.
- 8 Would you agree that it would be improper for
- 9 anyone speaking on behalf of B.A.T. Industries to
- 10 make statements to the public that were misleading
- 11 about cigarettes that were manufactured by any of its
- 12 group companies?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 14 A. And I think, I mean, as I've stated before, in
- 15 terms of giving accurate and appropriate information
- 16 to the public, it is absolutely correct that that
- 17 should represent the understanding of the company.
- 18 Q. All right. And you would agree that it would be
- 19 improper for anyone speaking on behalf of BATCO to
- 20 make statements to the public that were misleading
- 21 about cigarettes that were manufactured by it or one
- 22 of its group companies?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 24 A. I mean, again, I mean, I think it's -- it's the
- 25 same answer, that any public statement should --

- 1 should be made on the basis of -- of the company
- 2 knowledge and should not rep -- misrepresent that
- 3 company's knowledge.
- 4 Q. Now do you agree that B.A.T. Industries has a
- 5 responsibility to inform smokers about the -- the
- 6 hazards which it might be aware of that are
- 7 associated with cigarettes sold by its subsidiary
- 8 companies?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Asked and answered.
- 10 MR. FRANKEL: Object to form as well.
- 11 A. I think British-American Tobacco Company clearly
- 12 takes a look at the scientific literature relating to
- 13 smoking and health and will -- will -- will make any
- 14 public statements responsive to that. I think B.A.T.
- 15 Industries relies upon British-American Tobacco
- 16 Company Limited for its information and, if it is to
- 17 speak on these matters, should speak accurately.
- 18 It's a responsibility of -- of people like myself of
- 19 British-American Tobacco Company to ensure that the
- 20 information is as accurate as -- as possible.
- 21 Q. Well, sir, do -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 22 Does B.A.T. Industries accept an interest in the
- 23 health of the people who smoke cigarettes
- 24 manufactured by its subsidiaries?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.

- 1 A. I'm sorry, could you ask it again.
- 2 Q. Certainly. Does B.A.T. Industries accept an
- 3 interest in the health of the people who smoke
- 4 cigarettes manufactured by its subsidiaries?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 6 A. I mean, British-American Tobacco looks at the
- 7 smoking-and-health issue. B.A.T. Industries would
- 8 certainly be informed about developments in relation
- 9 to smoking and health as it may relate to -- I mean,
- 10 clearly to smokers.
- 11 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. My question's
- 12 different, sir.
- 13 My question is: Does B.A.T. Industries
- 14 recognize that it is -- has a responsibility for the
- 15 health of the smokers who smoke cigarettes
- 16 manufactured and sold by its subsidiary companies?
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to counsel's
- 18 statement. Objection, asked and answered. Objection
- 19 to the form.
- 20 A. I think B.A.T. Industries would wish to ensure
- 21 that it -- or not ensure, but be informed that its
- 22 British-American Tobacco, its tobacco operation, was
- 23 being responsible in relation to smoking and health.
- 24 I mean, the fact is that, I mean, information for
- 25 smokers, whether they decide to -- to choose to smoke

- 1 or not, comes effectively from the public health
- 2 authorities. I think if British-American Tobacco
- 3 were to misrepresent its views to the science --
- 4 related to the science, that would not be a good
- 5 thing, and I believe B.A.T. Industries is comfortable
- 6 that the actions of British-American Tobacco have
- 7 been responsible in that matter.
- 8 And the fact is that in terms of smokers and
- 9 their decision or a person, an adult, and their
- 10 decision whether to smoke or not really is shaped by
- 11 the public environment.
- 12 Q. Well, sir, from time -- from time to time B.A.T.
- 13 Industries makes statements in that public
- 14 environment, doesn't it?
- 15 A. Yes, it does, on all sorts of matters.
- 16 Q. And it makes statements in the public
- 17 environment about smoking and health, doesn't it?
- 18 A. I believe it has on occasion.
- 19 Q. And in fact, you're aware that Mr. Broughton
- 20 made a statement concerning smoking-and-health issues
- 21 just last year that was reported in the Wall Street
- 22 Journal; correct?
- 23 A. I'm -- I know that some statements have been
- 24 reported in a variety of press, and I'm not sure
- 25 exactly what article you're referring to.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 2 Exhibit 500, please.
- 3 MR. FRANKEL: Ms. Wivell, just for
- 4 clarification, for the -- for the record, it's -- I
- 5 believe it's B-A-T Industries as opposed to B.A.T.
- 6 Industries.
- 7 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 500 was handed
- 8 to the witness.)
- 9 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 10 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 11 as Exhibit 500, this is a -- an article entitled
- 12 "B.A.T Industries Pretax Profit Rose 5 percent; Sale
- 13 of Tobacco Business Under Review"; correct?
- 14 A. Yes, that's what it says at the top of this
- 15 article.
- 16 Q. All right. And for the record, I will state
- 17 that this was a -- an article that was clipped out of
- 18 the Wall Street Journal from my office on 10/31/96.
- 19 Sir, if you look at the second column in the exhibit,
- 20 you see a statement by Martin Broughton, don't you?
- 21 A. There's various statements in the second
- 22 column.
- 23 Q. All right. Do you see the paragraph that begins
- 24 "Although B.A.T's Brown & Williamson" --
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. -- "unit in the U.S. has been accused of
- 2 concealing research that showed a link between
- 3 smoking cigarettes and disease, Mr. Broughton said
- 4 the charges are unfounded"?
- 5 A. Yes, I see that.
- 6 Q. He said, quote, "'We haven't concealed, we do
- 7 not conceal and we will never conceal "; correct?
- 8 A. Yes, he said that.
- 9 Q. He goes on to say, "'We have no internal
- 10 research which proves that smoking causes lung cancer
- 11 or other diseases or, indeed, that smoking is
- 12 addictive'"; correct?
- 13 A. Yes, he does.
- 14 Q. Now, sir, were you consulted when Mr. Broughton
- 15 made this public statement?
- 16 A. Yes, I was.
- 17 Q. You were not consulted by him, though, were
- 18 you?
- 19 A. No, I wasn't.
- 20 Q. You were consulted by the solicitor?
- 21 A. Actually, no, I wasn't. I was consulted by
- 22 the -- the gentleman who was in charge of consumer
- 23 and regulatory affairs at the time, a chap called
- 24 Andrew Napier.
- 25 Q. And, sir, you understand that B.A.T. Industries'

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 chairman of the board had an obligation to speak
- 2 correctly when he made this statement?
- 3 A. I believe Mr. Broughton's the chief executive
- 4 officer, not the chairman, but yes, I mean, I think
- 5 he's -- I mean, as I've -- I said previously, anyone
- 6 speaking publicly has a responsibility to speak
- 7 accurately.
- 8 Q. All right. And because it would be a breach of
- 9 B.A.T. Industries' duty to misrepresent the knowledge
- 10 that it had concerning these subjects, wouldn't it?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, calls
- 14 for a legal conclusion.
- 15 A. I mean, I don't know what "duty" means, but
- 16 certainly I think as a responsible company we should
- 17 speak accurately.
- 18 Q. All right. Well let's use the word
- 19 "obligation." It would be a breach of B.A.T.
- 20 Industries' obligation, wouldn't it, to make
- 21 misstatements about smoking-and-health issues like
- 22 this to the public press, wouldn't it?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- MR. FRANKEL: And asked and answered.
- 25 A. I mean, again I believe that British-American

- 1 Tobacco and B.A.T. Industries should speak
- 2 accurately. I think that's what's -- what's been
- 3 done in this case.
- 4 Q. Well, sir, it would be a breach of -- no, strike
- 5 that.
- 6 When B.A.T. Industries makes public statements
- 7 like this one in Exhibit 500, you expect people to
- 8 read them; right?
- 9 A. I mean, it's -- a statement like this presumably
- 10 will be read by some people who read this newspaper.
- 11 Q. And when B.A.T. Industries makes public
- 12 statements on smoking and health like that made in
- 13 Exhibit 500, it expects people to rely on the
- 14 statements made in -- in the -- made therein; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 16 overbroad.
- 17 A. I mean, I think, I mean, a statement like this
- 18 read by someone who picked up the Wall Street Journal
- 19 that day would be read in -- in conjunction with the
- 20 whole environment related to -- to smoking and
- 21 health. I'm sure anyone who picked up the Wall
- 22 Street Journal on -- what was this? -- the 31st day
- 23 of the 10th month of '96 would have also read in --
- 24 in the Wall Street Journal that month a whole series
- 25 of other things related to smoking and health,

- 1 probably with quite different views.
- 2 I think for B.A.T. Industries' statement, it
- 3 should be accurate, but in terms of a person in the
- 4 street, whether they rely upon that as to form their
- 5 view, they would presumably take that as the view
- 6 of -- of Mr. Broughton. Whether they use that to
- 7 form their view of the general situation, well it
- 8 would be one part of the equation.
- 9 Q. All right. But you expect that people will
- 10 believe what you say when you speak publicly, and by
- 11 "you" I mean B.A.T. Industries; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form and
- 13 asked and answered.
- 14 A. I think people reading this statement will view
- 15 that as the view of British-American Tobacco or
- 16 B.A.T. Industries, yes.
- 17 Q. All right. And you expect people to believe
- 18 you, don't they -- don't you?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form,
- 20 overbroad.
- 21 A. Well I mean, I hope people will think that we
- 22 are telling the truth to the best of our ability.
- 23 Again in terms of someone's forming an opinion on
- 24 these matters, this would be one part of a very large
- 25 body of information that any individual person will

- 1 be -- would take in to try and form a view, if they
- 2 wished to, on this matter.
- 3 Q. All right. And when B.A.T. Industries makes
- 4 public statements on smoking and health, it hopes
- 5 that people believe what it says, doesn't it?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad, asked
- 7 and answered.
- 8 A. I'm not sure whether we -- we hope that people
- 9 would -- would believe us or not. I mean, we would
- 10 give a statement which is true to the best of our
- 11 knowledge, and -- and obviously it's up to an
- 12 individual person to take that as the -- whichever
- 13 way they wish to take it. As long as we speak
- 14 accurately, I think that's -- that's as far as we can
- 15 go.
- And I don't think, I mean, there's any
- 17 suggestion, for example, with this article that --
- 18 that we went out to seek this, and my guess would be
- 19 that this is an interview that was -- was given on
- 20 the request of the media.
- 21 Q. Well, sir, when B.A.T. Industries gives
- 22 interviews in response to requests from the media and
- 23 makes public statements, it expects that people
- 24 will -- no, strike that.
- When B.A.T. Industries gives interviews in

- 1 response to requests from the media and makes public
- 2 statements, it hopes that people believe what is
- 3 said; right?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This has been
- 5 asked and answered repeatedly. Also objection to the
- 6 form as overbroad.
- 7 A. I mean, I think we would -- we would hope that
- 8 people may understand that is our view of the
- 9 situation. Again, I mean, that will be one very
- 10 small part of a general set of information that any
- 11 one individual may take to form a view if they wish
- 12 to form a view.
- 13 Q. And it would be reasonable for people to believe
- 14 what B.A.T. Industries says when it speaks publicly;
- 15 right?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 17 question.
- 18 A. I think -- I mean, and I can speak for myself in
- 19 terms of reading any newspaper article. If there's a
- 20 statement made by -- by any chief executive of a
- 21 company, I would assume that the views that that
- 22 person is making are accurate views in -- in his or
- 23 her opinion. Whether I form a view as to that is
- 24 something I will take within myself as being the key
- 25 resident knowledge on that issue, well maybe, maybe

- 1 not; it depends on the situation.
- 2 Q. Well let me ask it this way: When BATCO makes
- 3 public statements about smoking and health, does it
- 4 expect that people will believe what it says?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 6 overbroad.
- 7 A. When, for example, I would make a -- a statement
- 8 to someone from a newspaper on an inquiry, all I hope
- 9 is -- is that that statement's reflected as an
- 10 accurate impression of what I say. In terms of what
- 11 a person picking up the newspaper and -- that carries
- 12 that article, their understanding, I would certainly
- 13 hope that they would understand that what I have said
- 14 is -- is accurate to my knowledge, but it would be
- 15 only one very small part perhaps of -- of a general
- 16 information that anyone would take on these matters.
- 17 Q. Well when you make these statements, don't you
- 18 hope that people believe what you say?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, asked
- 20 and answered.
- 21 A. When I speak to the media, for example, I would
- 22 speak accurately and I would hope that people would
- 23 understand that what I say is accurate. Again in
- 24 terms of how they form a view on that matter, that
- 25 will be one part of a -- a very broad equation.

- 1 Q. Well, sir, your job, if I understand it
- 2 correctly, is to speak on behalf of BATCO. That's
- 3 part of your regular job; right?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 5 A. One part of the role that I take is -- is to
- 6 ensure that when British-American Tobacco Company
- 7 Limited speaks on -- on matters related to smoking
- 8 and health, they speak as accurately as possible --
- 9 Q. And --
- 10 A. -- and --
- 11 Q. -- you -- I'm sorry.
- 12 A. -- and don't misrepresent the science and
- 13 particularly when you're trying to translate
- 14 something which is very complex into lay language.
- 15 That's certainly one part of my role, and on
- 16 occasions I have spoken to the media.
- 17 Q. Well, sir, and isn't it also your job to try and
- 18 form statements that will reassure smokers?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 20 overbroad.
- 21 A. I mean, the fact is that the type of statements
- 22 we will make on smoking and health reflect the
- 23 scientific matters. The fundamentals of -- of a lot
- 24 of our statements are our respect for public health
- 25 authorities, and I can't think of -- of any instance

- 1 where British-American Tobacco has made public
- 2 statements that would have had a major influence in
- 3 and above what the public health authorities said in
- 4 relation to smoking and health. When we do speak on
- 5 these matters, it is clearly critical that we speak
- 6 with as much accuracy as possible in relation to the
- 7 underlying science.
- 8 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 9 Sir, isn't part of your job description to
- 10 reassure smokers --
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 12 Q. -- that smoke BATCO or B.A.T. Group products?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Apologize. Objection to the
- 14 form.
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. It's not part of your job at all; is that your
- 17 testimony?
- 18 A. My testimony is that -- that I have -- I have no
- 19 part of my role within British-American Tobacco with
- 20 a specific intention to reassure smokers. I think
- 21 people who choose to smoke do so in -- in light of --
- 22 of the broad information that's available to them,
- 23 and that overwhelmingly is information related to the
- 24 public health authorities. And there is nothing that
- 25 I do as part of my job that is specifically trying to

- 1 discourage smokers from taking their view from what's
- 2 generally available in the public environment.
- 3 Q. All right. Sir, let's change the subject a
- 4 little bit.
- 5 When it comes to the delegated authority that
- 6 BATCO has from B.A.T. Industries, you would agree
- 7 that policy matters are matters that are retained for
- 8 B.A.T. Industries to decide; right?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 10 MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 11 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "policy matters."
- 12 If --
- 13 Q. All right. Well you understand that B.A.T.
- 14 Industries has delegated some authority on various
- 15 issues to some of its operational companies; right?
- 16 A. I mean, I think that B.A.T. Industries expects
- 17 companies like British-American Tobacco to -- to
- 18 operate in a fashion and they will be informed of the
- 19 way those -- those companies operate.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, isn't it true that B.A.T. Industries
- 21 retains for itself the decisions on policy matters?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 23 A. Again it depends what you mean by "policy
- 24 matters." If you're referring, for example, to
- 25 actions in relation to smoking and health, those --

- 1 those would be things that would be dealt with at
- 2 British-American Tobacco.
- 3 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that the
- 4 determination of policy concerning business
- 5 parameters for the operating companies is retained by
- 6 B.A.T. Industries?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 8 A. Again I -- I think I need an example of what
- 9 kind of policy, which I guess you're going to provide
- 10 me.
- MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 12 Exhibit 2301. Well wait a second. I have one that
- 13 has -- I have a copy that is marked, so I don't think
- 14 we need to do that.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- MS. WIVELL: Oops.
- MR. SHEFFLER: I'll take that one.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, showing you what was previously marked as
- 20 Defendants' Exhibit 2301, this is the delegated
- 21 authority from B.A.T. Industries; correct?
- 22 A. Well it says at the top of this document
- 23 "DELEGATED AUTHORITY."
- 24 Q. All right. And --
- MR. SHEFFLER: What -- excuse me. Counsel,

- 1 my copy has -- has -- the very top of the document is
- 2 cut off. Is that -- is that -- okay, all right.
- 3 Q. And this is signed by David Wilson and dated
- 4 July 26, 1994; correct?
- 5 A. Yeah, it is.
- 6 Q. Now it says under here -- on the first page
- 7 under "SUBJECT" it says "POLICY"; right?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: There's two "SUBJECT."
- 9 A. It says "1. POLICY" and "2. FINANCE."
- 10 Q. All right. Look under the policy section. Do
- 11 you see "Determination of business parameters for
- 12 each Operating Group, " point (c)?
- 13 A. Yes, it says "Determination of business
- 14 parameters for each Operating Group."
- 15 Q. And the reference to that is the main board;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. It says "ULTIMATE REFERENCE."
- 18 Q. That means that the ultimate responsibility
- 19 rests with B.A.T. Industries' board; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 21 A. I don't know. I mean, at the top of this
- 22 document it talks about "The B.A.T Industries Group
- 23 has evolved an organization which encourages the
- 24 exercise of a high degree of autonomy within the
- 25 framework approved by the Board" and "Thus, the

- 1 freedom and responsibilities in operations reside in
- 2 Operating Groups"
- 3 Q. And then it goes on to talk about things which
- 4 are reserved to the board; correct?
- 5 A. No. It goes on to say "except in respect of
- 6 matters which affect B.A.T Industries' interest as a
- 7 shareholder in Operating Groups, which should be
- 8 referred to the Chief Executive's Committee ...
- 9 and/or the Main Board."
- 10 Q. And the main board it refers to is B.A.T.
- 11 Industries'; correct?
- 12 A. I would assume that is the case.
- 13 Q. And if we look down under "POLICY," under point
- 14 (c), "Determination of business parameters for each
- 15 Operating Group, i.e. Guidelines to Operating
- 16 Groups," is the responsibility of the main board;
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. No, it says the ultimate reference, and I'm not
- 19 sure precisely what ultimate reference is. I would
- 20 assume given what it says at the top of this document
- 21 it would be that the main board in this case would be
- 22 looking broadly at the kind of actions that are
- 23 happening at the operating group level. But the --
- 24 the framework is that the company expects a high
- 25 degree of autonomy within its operating group.

- 1 Q. But under "POLICY," sir, the "Determination of
- 2 business parameters for each Operating Group, i.e.
- 3 Guidelines to Operating Groups, " the ultimate
- 4 reference is to the main board; correct?
- 5 A. That's what it says in this document.
- 6 Q. All right.
- 7 A. I'm not sure what that absolutely means.
- 8 Q. All right. Sir, you understand that for the
- 9 last approximately 40 years the policy concerning
- 10 smoking and health has been dictated by -- no, strike
- 11 that.
- 12 You understand that today the policy concerning
- 13 smoking and health, what is said publicly by the
- 14 B.A.T. Group companies is the ultimate responsibility
- 15 of the B.A.T. Industries board; correct?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 17 Objection, asked and answered.
- 18 A. No, I -- that's not my understanding. I mean, I
- 19 think what you'll find is that -- that in terms of
- 20 ensuring the company is speaking accurately, what
- 21 happens is that -- that that takes part of
- 22 British-American Tobacco Company Limited and in fact
- 23 today a lot of that takes part in -- in the body of
- 24 myself. And if B.A.T. Industries are speaking on
- 25 such matters, they would actually rely upon myself

- 1 and from British-American Tobacco Company Limited to
- 2 ensure accuracy in terms of the science.
- 3 Q. Sir, I'm going to show you what's previously
- 4 been marked as Exhibit 317. This is a document Bates
- 5 numbered 620789910; correct?
- 6 A. It's 620789910, yes.
- 7 Q. This is on B.A.T. Industries stationery; right?
- 8 A. What it says at the top is "B.A.T INDUSTRIES,"
- 9 yes.
- 10 Q. And it says "TO ALL OPERATING GROUP
- 11 CHAIRMAN/LIAISON DIRECTORS, LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS IN
- 12 SMOKING & HEALTH ISSUES"; right?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Just for the record, this
- 15 document was not predesignated. Has this been used
- 16 in a --
- 17 MS. WIVELL: This document was
- 18 predesignated, sir.
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: In this deposition?
- 20 MS. WIVELL: It's previously been marked as
- 21 an exhibit in a B.A.T./BATCO/B&W deposition.
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: So it doesn't appear in the
- 23 predesignation list of the 500 or so documents you've
- 24 designated for this deposition?
- MS. WIVELL: It's under the first subject,

- 1 sir, the first -- the very first item listed, I
- 2 believe.
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Oh, all deposition exhibits
- 4 from previous depositions? Is that -- is that how
- 5 this comes about, because it -- I don't have anything
- 6 on mine?
- 7 MS. WIVELL: Well can you read that there?
- 8 Doesn't that say --
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: It doesn't say here that
- 10 this is from a previous deposition.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: All right. Mr. LaBorde, would
- 12 you get out Exhibit 317.
- MR. SHEFFLER: If you'll -- if you'll state
- 14 that for the record, I'll accept it.
- MS. WIVELL: I did already state that for
- 16 the record.
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Well I didn't hear it. If
- 18 it's 317 from a previous deposition, fine.
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir, this document says "Recent changes in the
- 21 law in some states in the U.S.A. have resulted in a
- 22 fresh spate of litigation against the tobacco
- 23 industry" here. "For this reason it is most
- 24 important that other members of the Group are
- 25 constantly aware of B.A.T Industries' stance on

- 1 Smoking & Health"; correct?
- 2 A. That's what --
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: It actually says "there,"
- 4 not "here" in the first sentence, but --
- 5 A. With that noted, yes, that's what it says here.
- 6 Q. And then it says "I should be grateful if you
- 7 would ensure the widest possible circulation in your
- 8 Operating Group of the Group policy on Smoking &
- 9 Health Issues as summarized in the attached note";
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. That's what it says.
- 12 Q. All right. And attached to that is the B.A.T.
- 13 stance -- B. -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 14 Attached to that is B.A.T. Industries' stance on
- 15 smoking and health; correct?
- 16 A. No, what's attached here is titled "LEGAL
- 17 CONSIDERATIONS ON SMOKING & HEALTH POLICY" dated
- 18 March 1984.
- 19 Q. And what is attached there is what is referred
- 20 to as the B.A.T. Industries' stance on smoking and
- 21 health in the first paragraph of Exhibit 317; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 23 A. If I can just read it a second.
- I mean, what -- sorry, should I answer a
- 25 specific question?

- 1 Q. Let me ask the question again.
- 2 A. Yeah, thanks.
- 3 Q. And what is attached there is what is referred
- 4 to as the B.A.T. Industries' stance on smoking and
- 5 health in the first paragraph of Exhibit 317?
- 6 A. Well this -- this set of four paragraphs starts
- 7 by saying it's a note that summarizes the policy of
- 8 B.A.T. Industries Group in relation to
- 9 smoking-and-health issues and goes on to say that the
- 10 group's position, which I think probably refers to
- 11 the tobacco elements of the group, and also states
- 12 in -- in paragraph two that it's essential that
- 13 statements about cigarette smoking or the
- 14 smoking-and-health issue generally must be factually
- 15 and scientifically correct.
- 16 I think my understanding of -- of what this
- 17 document is is that it's referring to the -- the
- 18 various -- I don't know whether it's policies or
- 19 positions, but certainly the overriding theme of what
- 20 the British-American Tobacco Group of tobacco
- 21 companies sees as reasonable in relation to smoking
- 22 and health, and that certainly includes that it's
- 23 essential that statements about cigarette smoking or
- 24 smoking and health must be factual or/and
- 25 scientifically correct.

- 1 Q. All right, sir. I move to strike as
- 2 nonresponsive. My question -- and this will go a
- 3 whole lot faster if you just listen to it. Isn't it
- 4 a fact --
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to counsel's
- 6 statements.
- 7 Q. Isn't it a fact, sir, that what is attached is
- 8 what is referred to as the B.A.T. Industries' stance
- 9 on smoking and health in the first paragraph of
- 10 Exhibit 317?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 12 answered.
- 13 A. I'm sorry, I don't see the word "stance." Maybe
- 14 I'm just missing it.
- 15 Q. Sir, could you turn back to the first page of
- 16 Exhibit 317.
- 17 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I was looking at the second
- 18 page.
- 19 Q. And then it says "For this reason it is ...
- 20 important that other members of the Group are
- 21 constantly aware of B.A.T Industries' stance on
- 22 Smoking & Health."
- 23 A. That's what it says on the first page.
- 24 Q. And then in order to assure that all of the
- 25 companies were aware of B.A.T. Industries' stance on

- 1 smoking and health, the second page of the document
- 2 was circulated to the chief executive officer of each
- 3 of the tobacco operating companies within B.A.T.
- 4 Industries; correct?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 6 A. I mean, I don't know whether that is the case
- 7 from -- from the page I've -- I've got here. I mean,
- 8 if I assume that these were two pages that went
- 9 together, it does say on the top of the first page
- 10 "TO ALL OPERATING GROUP CHAIRMAN/LIAISON
- 11 DIRECTORS."
- 12 Q. And then if we look at the second page, the
- 13 first sentence says "This note summarises the policy
- 14 of the BAT Industries Group in relation to smoking &
- 15 health issues"; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Asked and answered.
- 17 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 18 Q. All right. Now, sir, isn't it true that even
- 19 before B.A.T. Industries became the holding company
- 20 for the B.A.T. Group, that the stance on
- 21 smoking-and-health issues for the operating companies
- 22 within the B.A.T. Group was dictated by BATCO?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 24 assumes facts not in evidence.
- 25 A. I mean, the stance is not dictated by anyone. I

- 1 think the stance, as it says here, is dictated by
- 2 what -- what the science says. You know, this
- 3 document talks about ensuring and -- that statements
- 4 made about cigarette smoking or smoking-and-health
- 5 issues must be factual and scientifically correct.
- 6 So I don't think there's any determination of -- of
- 7 individuals on what the stance should be other than
- 8 people reviewing the scientific matters and -- and
- 9 trying to ensure that companies speak accurately and
- 10 factually on those matters.
- 11 Q. Well, sir, doesn't the second paragraph -- I'm
- 12 sorry.
- 13 Doesn't the second sentence of the first
- 14 paragraph say "Although primarily the concern of the"
- 15 tobacco group's "interests, it is important for
- 16 senior executives in other parts of the Group to be
- 17 aware of the stance taken"?
- 18 A. I mean, I think it says exactly that, and what I
- 19 would read from that is that -- that clearly it is --
- 20 is the tobacco companies of the British -- or the
- 21 B.A.T. Group who have the primary -- I don't know
- 22 whether it's responsibility, but certainly the -- the
- 23 people that -- that should be speaking accurately in
- 24 relation to smoking and health, but that other
- 25 companies within B.A.T. Industries should be aware

- 1 of -- of what the tobacco side of the business is
- 2 saying. I think that sounds reasonable.
- 3 Q. Well and one of the reasons they wanted to be
- 4 aware of the tobacco -- what the tobacco side of the
- 5 business was saying is so that they would avoid
- 6 making any statements that might adversely affect the
- 7 group's tobacco interests in litigation in the United
- 8 States; isn't that true?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 10 assumes facts not in evidence, overbroad.
- 11 A. I mean, that's speculation. I would imagine
- 12 that, for example, within our financial services at
- 13 the moment we wouldn't expect anyone to be speaking
- 14 on smoking and health if they didn't have adequate
- 15 information related to the science related to that.
- 16 I think probably as a matter of general business
- 17 there would be interests in other sides to the
- 18 business on -- on what the science says on -- on
- 19 smoking and health, but I -- as far as I can tell,
- 20 there's -- there's no indication from this memo
- 21 that -- that -- that one is trying to ensure that --
- 22 that various parts of -- of the company are saying
- 23 anything which is not factually accurate.
- 24 Q. Well, sir, doesn't the last paragraph state
- 25 "Non-tobacco companies in the Group must

- 1 particularly beware of any commercial activities or
- 2 conduct which could be construed as discrimination
- 3 against tobacco or tobacco manufacturers (whether or
- 4 not involving companies within the Group), since this
- 5 could adversely affect the position of Brown &
- 6 Williamson in current US product liability litigation
- 7 in the United States"?
- 8 A. That's what it says. I'm not sure what it means
- 9 by "commercial activities or conduct." If it refers
- 10 to any non-tobacco company within the group making a
- 11 statement which isn't based, as it says in paragraph
- 12 two, on -- on being factually and scientifically
- 13 correct, then, I mean, I think that's probably a
- 14 sensible statement.
- 15 Q. And then it even refers people to the B.A.T.
- 16 Industries legal department, who have up-to-date
- 17 information on the legal situation affecting the
- 18 tobacco companies; right?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection as argumentative,
- 20 but you can answer.
- 21 A. I mean, it does say that "BAT Industries Legal
- 22 Department ... have up-to-date information on the
- 23 legal situation affecting ... tobacco companies."
- 24 Q. And it refers people to the B.A.T. Industries
- 25 legal department, doesn't it?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 2 A. I think what it says here in the last sentence
- 3 is that "If in doubt, companies should not hesitate
- 4 to consult their inhouse counsel"
- 5 Q. "Or BAT Industries Legal Department, who have
- 6 up-to-date information on the legal situation
- 7 affecting the tobacco companies"; right?
- 8 A. I mean, that's accurately read, but the -- the
- 9 first part of that is for people to -- to speak to
- 10 their in-house counsel, which I would assume would
- 11 refer to any tobacco company speaking to their lawyer
- 12 or lawyers responsible for -- for those types of
- 13 matters within the tobacco company. It seems to me
- 14 it also suggests that B.A.T. Industries' legal
- 15 department would have an overview of the information,
- 16 that that might be a useful source.
- 17 Q. Sir, you would agree that there has been a
- 18 coordinated policy concerning public statements on
- 19 smoking-and-health issues for the B.A.T. Group since
- 20 the early '60s, hasn't there?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad.
- 22 A. I'm not sure whether there's a formalized
- 23 policy. I think it's always been understood within
- 24 the company that the people should speak accurately
- 25 and -- as to issues related to smoking and health.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 2 Exhibit 316, please.
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 316 was handed
- 4 to the witness.)
- 5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 6 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 7 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 8 as Exhibit 316, this is a document entitled "STRICTLY
- 9 CONFIDENTIAL, TO ALL NUMBER 1s OF ASSOCIATED
- 10 COMPANIES, SMOKING AND HEALTH"; right?
- 11 A. Yeah, the title is "STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL, TO
- 12 ALL NUMBER 1s OF ASSOCIATED COMPANIES, " and then the
- 13 title underneath that says "SMOKING AND HEALTH."
- 14 Q. And it says "We have recently reviewed the Group
- 15 policy on Smoking and Health and the enclosed
- 16 strictly confidential document ... supersedes the
- 17 previous policy document circulated on 12th June
- 18 1970"; correct?
- 19 A. That's what it says.
- 20 Q. And isn't it true that this document sets forth
- 21 the guidelines for public statements that are to be
- 22 made by B.A.T. Group companies?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I don't know. I have to read it. If I could
- 25 just take a moment to take a look through it.

- 1 Q. All right. Well I'd like to take a break
- 2 anyway, so --
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Well if we're going to take
- 5 a break and have him read a document, we're going to
- 6 take a break so he can get a break as well.
- 7 MS. WIVELL: That's fine.
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Okay.
- 9 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 10 (Recess taken.)
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Defendants would like to
- 12 mark as Exhibit 2906 a letter from Martha K. Wivell
- 13 to Byron E. Starns dated August 5, 1997 with attached
- 14 Exhibit A, the predesignation list of documents for
- 15 the 30.0 -- 30.02(f) deposition of B.A.T. Industries
- 16 $\,$ and BATCO, and as 2907 defendants would like to mark
- 17 a fax to Byron Starns dated August 8th, 1997 sent at
- 18 4:48 from Robins Kaplan, which is a supplemental
- 19 designation list for this deposition.
- 20 (Defendants' Exhibits 2906 and 2907
- 21 were marked for identification.)
- 22 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 23 Q. All right. Sir, before we went off the record,
- 24 I asked you with regard to Exhibit 316 if this
- 25 document sets forth guidelines for public statements

- 1 that were to be adhered to by B.A.T. Group
- 2 companies.
- 3 A. I'm not sure it's -- it states guidance for
- 4 public statements. I've had an opportunity to read
- 5 the document. I think what it suggests is the
- 6 document, a general thrust of behavior, particularly
- 7 in terms of working with medical authorities and with
- 8 governments in relation to smoking and health.
- 9 Q. Just so we're clear here, this document
- 10 identifies the association of smoking with various
- 11 diseases as a major threat to the tobacco industry,
- 12 doesn't it?
- 13 A. The first sentence is "The association of
- 14 smoking with various diseases continues to be a major
- 15 threat to the tobacco industry."
- 16 Q. And, sir, isn't it true that even today the
- 17 association of smoking with various diseases is a
- 18 major threat to the tobacco industry?
- 19 A. I'm not sure what a major threat is. It's
- 20 most -- most clear that science has identified
- 21 association between smoking and various diseases,
- 22 that those associations have been taken by public
- 23 health authorities to -- to their view that smoking
- 24 causes various diseases and -- and the public health
- 25 authorities have given that view very clearly to the

- 1 public.
- 2 Q. All right. And, sir, if we look at the page
- 3 that has number three at the top, it says "View on
- 4 Causation, doesn't it?
- 5 A. I see page three and there's a title on the left
- 6 which says "View on Causation."
- 7 Q. All right. And it says in the -- that first
- 8 paragraph at the top of the page "As these are among
- 9 the people whom the industry most seeks to influence,
- 10 it is thought ... we should have a reasonable answer
- 11 on the question of causation"; correct?
- 12 A. That's what it says.
- 13 Q. All right. And it says "It is suggested our
- 14 answer should be expressed in future on the following
- 15 lines"; correct?
- 16 A. That's what it says.
- 17 Q. Would you please read what it says the suggested
- 18 answer on the question of causation should be?
- 19 A. Yeah, I can read that from this document. It
- 20 says on -- on page three of this document "'We
- 21 recognize that a substantial number of medical
- 22 authorities have expressed the opinion that a causal
- 23 relationship has been established between cigarette
- 24 smoking and lung cancer and certain other diseases,
- 25 while some doctors and other scientific experts have

- 1 expressed doubts about the evidence. It seems to us,
- 2 that in the absence of clinical proof of the"
- 3 mechanisms -- or "mechanism involved, the issue of
- 4 causation at the present time remains controversial.
- 5 This controversy can only be finally resolved through
- 6 further research and the industry is prepared to
- 7 cooperate with government and medical authorities in
- 8 any such work, " end of the quotation.
- 9 Q. Now, sir, if B.A.T. Industries believed at the
- 10 time this document was written or anytime thereafter
- 11 that cigarette smoking caused disease, would it tell
- 12 the public that?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- MR. FRANKEL: And lack of foundation.
- 15 A. And let me just try and respond to your
- 16 question, maybe just one point. I believe this is a
- 17 BATCO document. It is -- is headed Millbank, London,
- 18 which was the head office of British-American Tobacco
- 19 Company Limited. To try and to respond to your
- 20 question, and should B.A.T. Industries or
- 21 British-American Tobacco Company speak accurately on
- 22 its knowledge of the scientific matters, the answer
- 23 is yes.
- 24 Q. Well my -- that wasn't my question. My question
- 25 was: Does B.A.T. Industries -- I'm sorry, strike

- 1 that.
- 2 My question was: If B.A.T. Industries believed
- 3 that cigarette smoking caused disease, would it tell
- 4 the public?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The question was
- 6 asked and answered. Objection to the form.
- 7 A. If British-American Tobacco Company understood
- 8 the biological mechanisms related to smoking and
- 9 various diseases, it would certainly wish to ensure
- 10 that that was -- was public knowledge. My assumption
- 11 is once -- once those mechanisms are identified, that
- 12 will be a matter of very much public information. I
- 13 don't know whether that information will come from us
- 14 or from the -- the medical researchers that identify
- 15 this mechanism.
- 16 Q. Well I'm not talking about biological
- 17 mechanisms. I'm asking you this: If that --
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to statements of
- 19 counsel.
- 20 MS. WIVELL: Excuse me, I would appreciate
- 21 you not interrupt me, sir.
- 22 Q. I'm not talking about biological mechanisms,
- 23 sir. I'm asking you if B.A.T. Industries believed
- 24 that cigarette smoking caused disease, would it tell
- 25 the public so.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to statements of
- 2 counsel, objection as asked and answered, objection
- 3 to the form.
- 4 A. The answer again is yes, but we can't ignore
- 5 biological mechanisms because in terms of creating a
- 6 full understanding of what is the statistical
- 7 relationship between smoking and various diseases,
- 8 the biological mechanisms are critical in terms of
- 9 reaching that understanding. And that's why
- 10 British-American Tobacco Company does research in
- 11 this area, as do various academic institutions around
- 12 the world are still researching to try and find some
- 13 answers on this issue.
- 14 Q. Sir, if BATCO believed that cigarette smoking
- 15 caused disease, would it tell the public?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 17 A. I mean, again I think the answer's yes, once the
- 18 biological mechanisms have been identified, and it's
- 19 certainly the position of British-American Tobacco
- 20 Company that we will continue to invest in research
- 21 attempting to find those mechanisms. Once that is
- 22 out in public, then most certainly one would hope
- 23 people would be informed. The fact is that the
- 24 public health authorities have made a judgment based
- 25 on statistics already and they have -- they have --

- 1 they've clearly given their view that smoking is
- 2 causally related to certain diseases, and we respect
- 3 that view.
- 4 Q. Move to strike the nonresponsive portion.
- 5 Sir, my question is simple, and it's this: If
- 6 BATCO believed that cigarette smoking caused disease,
- 7 it would tell the public so, wouldn't it?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the statements
- 9 of counsel, objection as asked and answered.
- 10 A. And the answer is again British-American Tobacco
- 11 Company should and -- and will give statements to the
- 12 public that reflect its understanding of the
- 13 scientific issues, yes.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, would B.A.T. Industries tell the
- 15 public that it believed cigarette smoking caused
- 16 disease even if other members of the tobacco industry
- 17 didn't believe that to be the case?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, calls
- 19 for speculation, overbroad.
- 20 A. I mean, it is a matter of speculation, but I
- 21 can -- I can give you a response in that, I mean,
- 22 where I take information related to smoking and
- 23 health is from the scientific literature and from our
- 24 research. I don't take any notice at all as to what
- 25 other companies, whether it be tobacco companies or

- 1 other companies, say on the matter.
- 2 Q. All right. Let me ask about BATCO. If BATCO
- 3 believed that cigarette smoking caused disease, would
- 4 it tell the public even if other members of the
- 5 tobacco industry didn't believe that smoking caused
- 6 disease?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, calls for
- 8 speculation, objection to the form.
- 9 A. Again, I mean, regarding the speculation of your
- 10 question, I can still give an answer, and the answer
- 11 would be, I mean, my view, British-American Tobacco
- 12 Company -- and I -- I can state that because it would
- 13 be my view -- wouldn't take any notice of what anyone
- 14 else was saying, that whatever we would say would
- 15 have to be based on the scientific literature and
- 16 scientific research.
- 17 Q. So is it fair to say then that BATCO and B.A.T.
- 18 Industries would tell the public if they believed
- 19 smoking and -- smoking caused disease even if their
- 20 competitors didn't believe that?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, same
- 22 objections, asked and answered.
- 23 A. I mean, again I -- I say I -- my -- my own view
- 24 is I -- I would give statements on this matter as I
- 25 wouldn't take any note at all what -- what the other

- 1 tobacco companies were saying. What I would rely
- 2 upon is the scientific information.
- 3 Q. And when you say your own view, you are the
- 4 person who would make the statement for BATCO if it
- 5 believed that cigarette smoking caused cancer;
- 6 right?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 8 A. Most likely, yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. And if B.A.T. Industries believed that
- 10 cigarette smoking was addictive, would it tell the
- 11 public even if other members of the tobacco industry
- 12 didn't believe that?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, speculation,
- 14 overbroad.
- 15 A. And again, my view is that it wouldn't matter
- 16 what other companies were saying. I would give a
- 17 view based on what the scientific information says.
- 18 Q. All right. And if the scientific information
- 19 that was available to BATCO showed that cigarette
- 20 smoking was addictive, would you tell the public even
- 21 if the other members of the tobacco industry didn't
- 22 believe it?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 24 A. And again, as I tried to answer before, the
- 25 answer is yes, it doesn't really matter what other

- 1 companies say. I mean, the information again should
- 2 be based on the scientific information available.
- 3 Q. And if the scientific information available
- 4 showed that cigarette smoking was addictive, BATCO
- 5 would tell the public even if the other members of
- 6 the industry didn't --
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 8 Q. -- believe it; right?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Excuse me, excuse me.
- 10 Objection, asked and answered repeatedly as well as
- 11 speculation, overbroad.
- 12 A. And -- and again, my response is that it really
- 13 doesn't matter what other companies say. It's got to
- 14 be based on what the scientific literature says.
- 15 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that BATCO and B.A.T.
- 16 Industries have determined that it was important that
- 17 the industry speak as one with one voice on these
- 18 issues?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 20 A. And I think in that there's a commonality within
- 21 the -- the science, there certainly would have been
- 22 some understanding that in particular situations
- 23 there may be, for example, National Manufacturers'
- 24 Associations which would -- which would give views in
- 25 general on -- on what -- what the -- the various

- 1 views of members of the industry are. That does not
- 2 mean to say in any shape or form that those -- if
- 3 those views were inconsistent in terms of what the
- 4 science says, that British-American Tobacco would go
- 5 along with any other statement, and our views would
- 6 still be based very much upon the science and that is
- 7 very much what we would need to be in control of.
- 8 Q. Well isn't it a fact that policy at BATCO was to
- 9 try and persuade other members of the industry to
- 10 speak and behave in ways that were likely to
- 11 safeguard the future of the industry as a whole?
- 12 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 13 overbroad.
- 14 A. No. I think what -- what you've seen through
- 15 history just as -- as you see with pretty much any
- 16 industry, you find that there's the formation of
- 17 Manufacturers' Associations, which provide a single
- 18 point of view on industry matters. I must say, for
- 19 example, in the United Kingdom where there is a
- 20 National Manufacturers' Association which we are an
- 21 associate member of, if someone asked
- 22 British-American Tobacco a view on -- on smoking and
- 23 health, I would give the answer. I wouldn't refer
- 24 them to the National Manufacturers' Association.
- 25 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that it has been the

- 1 aim of BATCO to try and persuade all those concerned
- 2 with cigarettes toward a course of action designed to
- 3 preserve the industry's long-term commercial
- 4 interests?
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 6 overbroad.
- 7 A. I mean, I think in terms of the document you've
- 8 just asked me to read, I mean, there were some points
- 9 in that document that might be expressed in that
- 10 way. But the way I read this document is very much
- 11 ensuring that -- or suggesting that the various parts
- 12 of the tobacco operation act responsibly, work with
- 13 medical authorities in order to ensure that there's
- 14 full coop -- cooperation with those -- those
- 15 authorities.
- 16 Q. Sir, would you turn to the page that ends with
- 17 Bates number 866 of Exhibit 316. And there do you
- 18 see the phrase "Main aim"?
- 19 A. I'm sorry. It's 866?
- 20 Q. 866.
- 21 A. Yes, at the top there's a -- there's a bit on
- 22 the side which says "Main aim."
- 23 Q. All right. And it says, quote, "Our aim is to
- 24 persuade all those concerned other members of the
- 25 industry, members of the medical profession and

- 1 governments toward courses of action acceptable to
- 2 consumers and the public which are designed to
- 3 preserve the industry's long-term commercial
- 4 interests, and at the same time to be as reasonable
- 5 and realistic as possible in the light of scientific
- 6 developments"; correct?
- 7 A. That's what it says on that page.
- 8 Q. All right. And, sir, isn't it a fact that
- 9 B.A.T. during this period of time in the late '60s
- 10 and early '70s did try and convince the tobacco
- 11 companies of the world to speak as one voice on the
- 12 issue of smoking and health?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad, asked
- 14 and answered.
- 15 A. I mean, as far as I'm aware, there was no
- 16 concerted effort to try and ensure the companies
- 17 spoke with one voice other than clearly in some
- 18 countries there were National Manufacturers'
- 19 Associations that were formed to talk typically about
- 20 economic issues as opposed to smoking-and-health
- 21 issues. I think what this -- this document reflects
- 22 is -- is the need, as -- as you said here, to be
- 23 reasonable and realistic as possible in light of
- 24 scientific developments and again, as we go through
- 25 the document, of British-American Tobacco wishing to

- 1 work with -- with -- in cooperation with
- 2 governments.
- 3 Q. Well, sir, are you denying the fact that BATCO
- 4 spearheaded an effort so that the industry would
- 5 speak as one voice on the issue of smoking and
- 6 health?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 8 A. I mean, it's my understanding that
- 9 British-American Tobacco hasn't spearheaded an effort
- 10 to try and persuade anyone other than the people
- 11 taking a look at the view of the scientific matters.
- 12 I mean, clearly within this document what it says is
- 13 that, where possible, there should be industry
- 14 associations in terms of the broad areas of -- that
- 15 concern the tobacco industry, but it -- what it also
- 16 says in this document is that it is -- is absolutely
- 17 important that the company works with medical and
- 18 government opinion.
- 19 I think that has been the case. It's very
- 20 clearly illustrated in -- in the U.K. situation, and
- 21 in 1973, which is the date of this document, we saw
- 22 in the U.K. the -- the formation of the Independent
- 23 Scientific Committee on Smoking and Health, which
- 24 was -- very clearly, as you go through that period of
- 25 time from '73 onwards, illustrates what has been said

- 1 in this document as being a series of actions very
- 2 much in collaboration with the government and the
- 3 public health authorities.
- 4 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 5 Exhibit 499, please.
- 6 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 499 was handed
- 7 to the witness.)
- 8 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 9 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 10 Q. Sir, showing you what's been previously marked
- 11 as Exhibit 499, this is a document entitled "STRICTLY
- 12 CONFIDENTIAL, TO ALL NUMBER 1s OF ASSOCIATED
- 13 COMPANIES, SMOKING AND HEALTH"; correct?
- 14 A. Yeah, that's what it says at the top of the --
- 15 of the first page of this document. It doesn't have
- 16 any headed notepaper or anything, but that's what it
- 17 says.
- 18 Q. Now it says "Developments since March 1969";
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. That's what it says.
- 21 Q. Then it goes on to say "Since the document
- 22 attached to Mr. Dobson's letter of 25th March 1969
- 23 was sent to all Number 1s there have been certain
- 24 major developments which have led us to re-examine
- 25 our policy in this matter"; correct?

- 1 A. That's what it says.
- 2 Q. Now, sir, if you turn to page 858 or the
- 3 document that ends -- or the page that ends with
- 4 Bates number 858, do you see a heading entitled
- 5 "B.A.T. Leadership"?
- 6 A. It says "B.A.T. Leadership," yes.
- 7 Q. Then it says "The fact that we are the largest
- 8 tobacco company in the world, with extensive
- 9 interests in many countries, imposes on us the
- 10 responsibility to persuade other members of the
- 11 industry to agree to behave in ways likely to
- 12 safeguard the future of the industry as a whole";
- 13 correct?
- 14 A. That's what it says in this document.
- 15 Q. And, sir, isn't it a fact that after 1976 when
- 16 B.A.T. Industries became the holding company
- 17 responsible for the tobacco interests of the B.A.T.
- 18 Group that it was a policy of B.A.T. Industries that
- 19 the tobacco industry would only be able to defend
- 20 itself adequately against attack on the
- 21 smoking-and-health issues if it presented a united
- 22 front?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 24 objection to the assumptions in the question.
- 25 A. It's my understanding that in many situations

- 1 the various tobacco companies have worked together
- 2 through trade association. I don't think that that
- 3 takes anything away in terms of the types of actions
- 4 that have happened, and for example, again in the
- 5 United Kingdom it's clear that what the U.K.
- 6 government did was -- was to ask to cooperate with
- 7 all of the tobacco companies. So the whole program
- 8 of product modification in the U.K. wasn't involved
- 9 just one company, involved all the tobacco companies
- 10 together, primarily because it was the government's
- 11 aim to drive through product modification and they --
- 12 they could do that through the collaboration with
- 13 the -- the companies.
- 14 Q. So you're saying that B.A.T. did collaborate
- 15 with other tobacco industry companies to determine
- 16 what it should say publicly about smoking and
- 17 health?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 19 question, mischaracterizes the testimony.
- 20 A. Yeah, that's not what I said at all, and I mean,
- 21 I can't remember any instance during my employment at
- 22 British-American Tobacco that I've sat down and
- 23 discussed with a member of another company what
- 24 should be said on smoking and health. I mean, I have
- 25 on occasion discussed what -- what the science is,

- 1 but certainly not the public statements. The public
- 2 statements that British-American Tobacco make are our
- 3 own statements based on our own views of the
- 4 science.
- 5 What I -- what I was saying was that there have
- 6 clearly been both in the United Kingdom and the
- 7 United States whole series of programs where
- 8 government and industry have worked together, and
- 9 that relationship is clear that not just one but many
- 10 tobacco companies worked together with the government
- 11 on, for example, product modification programs.
- 12 Q. Sir, I'm not talking about government and
- 13 industry. I'm talking about within the industry.
- 14 Have you investigated to determine whether or not
- 15 there were actual meetings or conversations to
- 16 determine what should be said publicly on
- 17 smoking-and-health issues so the industry could speak
- 18 at -- with one voice?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 20 question, objection to counsel's statements as
- 21 improper.
- 22 A. I mean, I have personal knowledge certainly of a
- 23 fairly long period of time where -- where I've --
- 24 I've been involved in these matters, and again I
- 25 state that there's not been a point in time where --

- 1 where I would take a view just because another
- 2 company would say it. I mean, I would take a view on
- 3 the basis of science. In that the science is common,
- 4 it's hardly surprising that the various different
- 5 companies may express their views in a similar manner
- 6 on the basis of that science.
- 7 I -- I don't believe from anything that I've
- 8 investigated that anyone has sat down around in a
- 9 room as a group of companies and said, "Look, this is
- 10 what every single company should say," and if you
- 11 look at the, I mean, public statements of companies,
- 12 you'll find they are different and things that we may
- 13 say, for example, on environmental tobacco smoke may
- 14 be different from things that another company would
- 15 say.
- 16 Q. Sir, you've only been the spokesperson for BATCO
- 17 on these subjects since 1993; right?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 19 A. I'm not the spokesperson, but I'm -- I'm
- 20 certainly the one that's been significantly involved
- 21 in this, but -- and again, I mean, I don't know
- 22 whether it's a commonsense view or a view of -- of
- 23 things that I've seen. Clearly National
- 24 Manufacturers' Associations do -- and that's true of
- 25 the United Kingdom and I -- I gather it's true of the

- 1 United States -- try and represent an industry as --
- 2 as one, but I mean, the thought that there's a
- 3 gathering of -- of the industry around to make an
- 4 agreement that a particular statement should be made
- 5 I just don't see is -- is correct.
- 6 And I think in terms of what I've seen as
- 7 statements from various companies, they're clearly
- 8 not exactly the same language. And I mean, it's pure
- 9 speculation, but I'd be highly surprised that within
- 10 any other company the kind of statement that's laid
- 11 out in this document on causation is reflected in
- 12 another company's documents or their statements, but
- 13 please surprise me if you can.
- 14 Q. All right. Sir, would you get out Exhibit 586.
- 15 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't realize I have it.
- 16 Thank you.
- 17 O. That's the document that's entitled "SMOKING AND
- 18 HEALTH, STRATEGIES AND CONSTRAINTS"; correct?
- 19 A. Yeah, that's what it says at the top of this
- 20 document.
- 21 Q. Would you turn to the page that ends with Bates
- 22 number 560. The fourth paragraph there says "If it
- 23 can be achieved it is better to speak as an industry
- 24 and where this is possible BAT companies should seek
- 25 to get the industry in any particular country to

- 1 speak with one voice on policy matters"; right?
- 2 A. That's what it says there.
- 3 Q. Did you --
- 4 Were you aware of this paragraph before I
- 5 pointed it out to you, sir?
- 6 A. No, but I'm -- I'm aware of -- of the general
- 7 theme that, I mean, in many countries under National
- 8 Manufacturers' Associations people work together. I
- 9 don't get any understanding from this particular
- 10 paragraph that British-American Tobacco Company is
- 11 going to another company and saying, "Look, you've
- 12 got to take our view. Don't look at the scientific
- 13 issues related to that." And I think that's just not
- 14 the way the real world has worked.
- 15 Q. And, sir, are you denying that B.A.T.
- 16 Industries' policy is that the industry will only be
- 17 able to defend itself adequately from attack if it
- 18 speaks with a united voice?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This question's
- 20 been asked and answered repeatedly. I think we're
- 21 getting to the point where it's argumentative and
- 22 harassing.
- MR. FRANKEL: And object to form.
- 24 A. I mean, I can answer as to British-American
- 25 Tobacco Company's policy today is that, I mean, we

- 1 will be self-determinant in terms of what our views
- 2 are on -- on issues related to our business. Now you
- 3 will find around the world various National
- 4 Manufacturers' Associations that we will be members
- 5 of. You will also find around the world many
- 6 countries in which there aren't National
- 7 Manufacturers' Associations. All we wish to do is to
- 8 ensure that as far as -- as representations to the
- 9 public and those are accurate on the basis of the
- 10 science.
- 11 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 587 was marked
- for identification.)
- 13 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 14 Q. Sir, showing you --
- 15 A. Thanks.
- 16 Q. -- what's been marked as Plaintiffs'
- 17 Exhibit 587, these are 1982 B.A.T. board guidelines
- 18 concerning public affairs; correct?
- 19 A. The -- yeah, the front of this document says
- 20 "1982, B.A.T. BOARD GUIDELINES, PUBLIC AFFAIRS."
- 21 Q. All right. Would you turn to the page that ends
- 22 with Bates number 237.
- 23 A. Yes, got it.
- 24 Q. This page is stamped multiple times with the
- 25 word "SECRET," isn't it, sir?

- 1 A. Yes, it is.
- 2 Q. And under point ten on this page marked
- 3 "SECRET," it says "The Tobacco Industry will only be
- 4 able to defend itself" adequate -- "adequately
- 5 against attack if it presents a united response";
- 6 correct?
- 7 A. That's what it says on point ten.
- 8 Q. All right. And is this the first time anyone
- 9 has shown this to you, sir, or were you aware of this
- 10 particular part of the policy before today?
- 11 A. Actually, no, I hadn't seen this before I came
- 12 over here. One point I would make is that the thing
- 13 that you've just read out is -- is titled "PART 1
- 14 ASSUMPTIONS," so I'm not sure whether that is -- is a
- 15 speculation or a matter of fact.
- 16 Q. Well it says --
- 17 Before it says "PART 1 ASSUMPTIONS," it says
- 18 "B.A.T BOARD GUIDELINES, SMOKING ISSUES"; correct?
- 19 A. It says "B.A.T BOARD GUIDELINES, SMOKING ISSUES,
- 20 PART 1 ASSUMPTIONS."
- 21 Q. Now, sir, these guidelines were set up and it
- 22 was expected they would be followed; isn't that
- 23 true?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- MS. WIVELL: Let me rephrase the question.

- 1 Q. It was expected that these guidelines would be
- 2 followed; isn't that true?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 4 A. I mean, this strikes me as a paper that perhaps
- 5 was discussed at some board meeting or some other
- 6 meeting within British-American Tobacco which looked
- 7 at a variety of assumptions, and we have -- what is
- 8 it? -- gosh, 48 assumptions here dated March 1982,
- 9 and then it goes on later to talk about general
- 10 strategies, and -- and I'd need to read this to -- to
- 11 give you a view on that.
- But for example, in part II, general strategies,
- 13 it talks about social awareness and responsibility,
- 14 and point 2.2, it says "Above all we must ensure that
- 15 we never knowingly mislead our consumers and staff
- 16 and that we, as manufacturers, are able to
- 17 demonstrate that we are acting responsibly and have
- 18 concern for their interests at all times." I mean,
- 19 I'd have to read the rest of the document to -- to
- 20 give you our key points, but to, I mean, your -- your
- 21 key question, and that that first part was -- was an
- 22 assumption. I'm not sure what the assumption is
- 23 based on.
- 24 Q. All right. Are you telling us that you speak on
- 25 behalf of BATCO but you've never read board

- 1 guidelines on public affairs?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 3 A. I mean, I've obviously been very closely
- 4 involved in terms of what British-American Tobacco
- 5 has done in public, and I can certainly give you
- 6 testimony to what British-American Tobacco have --
- 7 have done in public. What is here I -- I frankly,
- 8 no, have not seen, but I can testify as to what --
- 9 what my view is of -- of the actions that
- 10 British-American Tobacco has -- has taken over the
- 11 years.
- 12 Q. Well, sir, have you ever read any B.A.T. board
- 13 guidelines on public affairs?
- 14 A. I'm not sure how many guidelines there have
- 15 been. In terms of -- I mean, I gather and I have
- 16 seen a variety of -- of think pieces. I'm not sure
- 17 if that's a understandable explanation of what I'm
- 18 trying to describe, but a variety of -- of -- of
- 19 documents where people try and make assumptions on --
- 20 in -- in regards to the public environment as to what
- 21 may happen, which may affect the future environment.
- 22 And I think that's been done in a variety of -- of
- 23 different forms.
- 24 I think in terms of -- of what British-American
- 25 Tobacco has done, no matter what guidelines are

- 1 there -- and there are -- certainly I have been
- 2 involved in writing some guidelines to companies in
- 3 relations -- to ensure they speak accurately in
- 4 relation to smoking and health. I can certainly
- 5 speak to the actual actions of the company through --
- 6 through -- you know, through history.
- 7 Q. Sir, isn't it true that the public position on
- 8 smoking and health which has been established for the
- 9 B.A.T. Group companies is dominated by legal
- 10 considerations arising out of smoking-related
- 11 lawsuits brought in the United States?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 13 objection to the assumptions not based upon evidence
- 14 in the record and objection to asked and answered.
- 15 A. Absolutely not. They're based on the science.
- 16 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 588 was marked
- for identification.)
- 18 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 21 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 588, this is a -- entitled "TALK
- 22 TO CONFERENCE, MARKETING LOW DELIVERY PRODUCTS,
- 23 19.1.82, THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY & ITS IMPACT ON"
- 24 SCIENCE "& MEDICAL ATTITUDES AND" OPINIONS; correct?
- 25 A. It says that. This is a talk to a conference,

- 1 and I -- I'd have to read on to see who was giving
- 2 that talk to the conference.
- 3 Q. Sir, would you turn to the page that ends with
- 4 Bates number 243.
- 5 A. Yes, I have that.
- 6 Q. And on this or --
- 7 During this talk regarding scientific and
- 8 medical attitudes and opinions, on this page it says
- 9 "Clearly the legal position especially USA is the
- 10 key concern"; correct?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the predicate
- 12 to the question. If the question is simply does it
- 13 state that, there's no objection, but I object to the
- 14 predicate.
- 15 A. I mean, it -- the document says "Clearly the
- 16 legal position especially USA is the key concern"
- 17 as one line in -- on page five.
- 18 Q. All right. And page five -- let me rephrase the
- 19 question.
- 20 Sir, on page 243 it says "Clearly the legal
- 21 position especially USA is the key concern";
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. As I said, on page five there's one line in --
- 24 in this whatever it is, a -- a -- a set of notes for
- 25 someone giving a -- a presentation, says "Clearly the

- 1 legal position especially USA is the key
- 2 concern."
- 3 Q. And then it goes on to say "We believe it is
- 4 possible to discuss the issues and the facts without
- 5 jeopodising the industry. The US law firms who
- 6 defend the industry in law suits have yet to agree
- 7 the way, and it is essential that we have their
- 8 approval before proceeding in any public sense";
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. Again that's what it states on -- on page five
- 11 as one point in a variety of points in this guidance
- 12 note to whoever was giving this presentation to
- 13 whichever conference.
- 14 Q. And, sir, does this help you recall that it was
- 15 the legal position that dominates what is said
- 16 publicly by the B.A.T. Group companies on the issue
- 17 of smoking and health?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to form.
- 19 A. No. I mean, again I -- I -- I respond as I
- 20 responded before, that fundamentally, I mean, our
- 21 positions on smoking and health are absolutely
- 22 dictated by what -- what is said in the scientific
- 23 arena and what are the science related to those
- 24 matters.
- 25 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 589 was marked

- for identification.)
- 2 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 3 Q. Sir, showing you --
- 4 A. Thanks.
- 5 Q. -- what's been marked as Plaintiffs'
- 6 Exhibit 589, this is a document Bates numbered
- 7 105359751; correct?
- 8 A. It's 1053597151, yeah.
- 9 Q. I believe you read the number wrong, sir.
- 10 A. Oh, I'm sorry.
- 11 Q. Let me just ask my question again.
- This is a document Bates numbered 105359751;
- 13 right?
- 14 A. That's right.
- 15 Q. Okay. It's entitled "B.A.T.: APPROACH TO
- 16 SMOKING AND HEALTH"; right?
- 17 A. It says "B.A.T.: APPROACH TO SMOKING AND
- 18 HEALTH, " dated 13th July 1973.
- 19 Q. Sir, would you turn to the last page of the
- 20 document. Does the last paragraph of the document
- 21 begin with the statement "Finally it should be noted
- 22 that B.A.T. operates under two special constraints
- 23 due to" the "interests in the U.S.A. First, there
- 24 are legal cases pending in the U.S.A. which restrict
- 25 what B.A.T. and its officers say in public"?

- 1 Correct?
- 2 A. That's what it says.
- 3 Q. Sir, and isn't it a fact that even today what
- 4 B.A.T. and BATCO say in public is governed by legal
- 5 considerations for cases relating to smoking and
- 6 health --
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 8 Q. -- brought in the United States?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Excuse me. Counsel, I'm
- 10 sorry. Objection, asked and answered. Objection to
- 11 the form.
- 12 A. No, obviously not. I mean, any statements that
- 13 I make to public are based on -- on science, and I --
- 14 I frankly don't give any consideration to litigation
- 15 anywhere in the world as long as I make my statements
- 16 based on science and I'm convinced that those
- 17 statements are accurate.
- 18 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the public positions
- 19 of the B.A.T. Group tobacco companies with respect to
- 20 causation are dominated by legal considerations?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 22 answered repeatedly.
- 23 A. And my answer is again -- is absolutely not.
- 24 I'm responsible, at least in part, for ensuring that
- 25 our public statements are as accurate as can be

- 1 possible based on what scientific information is
- 2 available.
- 3 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that by denying a causal
- 4 role for cigarette smoking in general, the B.A.T.
- 5 Group hopes to avoid liability in particular cases?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, calls for
- 7 speculation, overbroad.
- 8 A. I mean, let me perhaps give you some information
- 9 on what our position is on smoking and health.
- 10 What -- what we say and we will say clearly when
- 11 asked is that we believe, for example, on smoking and
- 12 lung cancer that smoking's an important risk factor.
- 13 We also believe and have knowledge that public health
- 14 authorities have used -- have -- have identified
- 15 statistical data and they have -- they believe that
- 16 smoking is a cause of lung cancer on the basis of
- 17 that information. We respect their view. That does
- 18 not stop us requiring to -- to undertake additional
- 19 research and to fund independent research to try and
- 20 identify biological mechanisms related to anything
- 21 that may be in tobacco smoke and lung cancer.
- 22 So, I mean, my response is that -- my response
- 23 is I've forgotten your question in the first place.
- 24 I'm sorry.
- 25 Q. All right. Well let me rephrase my question.

- 1 Does B.A.T. Industries believe smoking causes
- 2 lung cancer?
- 3 A. B.A.T. Industries would refer to the knowledge
- 4 resident at British-American Tobacco Company, and our
- 5 view is that smoking, for example, and lung cancer is
- 6 an important risk factor, and again I would say that
- 7 it is clear that public health authorities have made
- 8 judgments for many, many years that smoking is a
- 9 cause of lung cancer. What is evident is that we
- 10 continue to sponsor research to try and identify the
- 11 biological -- biological mechanisms. We have to do
- 12 that in order to identify something that we may be
- 13 able to change within the product, and frankly it's
- 14 not simply us doing that type of research. It's
- 15 research that's carried out in universities around
- 16 the world trying to understand the fundamental
- 17 biological mechanisms related to lung cancer.
- 18 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 19 question is not what public health authorities
- 20 believe. My question is: Does B.A.T. Industries
- 21 believe that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?
- 22 It's simple. "Yes" or "no"?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to the statements
- 24 of counsel. I object to the instruction of counsel
- 25 to answer the question in any way -- "yes" or "no."

- 1 The witness is entitled to answer the question in any
- 2 way that's appropriate, and I would object on the
- 3 basis of asked and answered.
- 4 A. Okay. Well let me answer it as -- as befits the
- 5 complexity of -- of the situation, and as I said, we
- 6 believe and it's clear from the statistical data
- 7 that's been produced over many years that smoking,
- 8 for example, is an important risk factor for lung
- 9 cancer. We also believe that the biological
- 10 mechanisms that may relate a substance in tobacco
- 11 smoke to lung cancer have not been identified. We
- 12 continue to support research in that area, as does
- 13 the general academic community.
- 14 Q. So no, you don't believe cigarette smoking
- 15 causes lung cancer; is that right?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 17 question. The witness can answer the question as he
- 18 deems appropriate.
- 19 A. I mean, that's not what I said at all. What
- 20 I -- what I said is that we respect in practical
- 21 terms what -- public health authorities, and if you
- 22 ask certainly from where I come from in the U.K.
- 23 anyone in the country what is their view on $\operatorname{--}$ on
- 24 smoking and health, they would take their view from
- 25 what public health authorities have said and would

- 1 say they believe smoking causes lung cancer.
- 2 As a company, we cannot stop there. We can't
- 3 rely entirely simply on the epidemiological data.
- 4 What we need to understand is the biological
- 5 mechanisms such that we could do something in
- 6 relation to our product which would be accepted
- 7 perhaps by public health authorities and be
- 8 beneficial.
- 9 Q. Well let me ask this: Does BATCO believe that
- 10 cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?
- 11 A. And my answer is -- is probably almost exactly
- 12 the same as -- as -- as I've just given before, but
- 13 I -- I can restate it again if you wish.
- 14 Q. Well "yes" or "no," does BATCO believe that
- 15 cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The witness can
- 17 answer the question as he deems appropriate.
- 18 A. And again, I mean, BATCO's belief is that this
- 19 issue is too complex to give a simple yes-or-no
- 20 answer, and what my response is based on the
- 21 scientific evidence is that smoking is an important
- 22 risk factor for lung cancer. It is the view of
- 23 public health authorities that -- that smoking is a
- 24 cause of lung cancer. We respect their view, but for
- 25 BATCO as a company wishing to make changes to its

- 1 product, we cannot stop there. We have to continue
- 2 to investigate, as the general academic community is,
- 3 the biological mechanisms that may relate some
- 4 substance in tobacco smoke to -- to lung cancer.
- 5 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that your answer which
- 6 you've just provided to the ladies and gentlemen is
- 7 carefully crafted to avoid legal liability for
- 8 smoking cases in the U.S.?
- 9 A. Absolutely not. I mean, my -- my answer is
- 10 based on my fundamental understanding of the
- 11 scientific knowledge. My answer is based upon what I
- 12 understand of what public health authorities have
- 13 said. My answer is based upon what I believe the
- 14 company has wished to do for many years in terms of
- 15 trying to look at product modifications which were
- 16 responsive to the needs of the public health
- 17 authorities.
- 18 Q. Sir, isn't it true that by repudiating a causal
- 19 role for cigarette smoking in general, your companies
- 20 hope to avoid liability in cigarette cases in the
- 21 U.S.?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 23 question, assumes facts not in evidence.
- 24 A. And the answer yet again is that the statement
- 25 that I gave you in relation to smoking and health is

- 1 based entirely upon the science, and I have no
- 2 considerations at all when I make that statement as
- 3 to whether there may be --
- 4 (Telephone interruption.)
- 5 A. -- whether there may be liability or not.
- 6 Sorry.
- 7 MS. WIVELL: Let's go off the record.
- 8 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 9 (Discussion off the record.)
- 10 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 11 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 12 Exhibit 443, this is a document entitled "CIGARETTE
- 13 SMOKING AND CAUSAL RELATIONSHIPS"; correct?
- 14 A. It says at the top "CIGARETTE SMOKING AND CAUSAL
- 15 RELATIONSHIPS, " yeah.
- 16 Q. The first paragraph says "The public position of
- 17 tobacco companies with respect to causal explanations
- 18 of the association of cigarette smoking and diseases
- 19 is dominated by legal considerations"; correct?
- 20 A. That's a correct reading of what is said in this
- 21 first page of the document.
- 22 Q. And it goes on to say "In the ultimate companies
- 23 wish to be able to dispute that a particular product
- 24 was the cause of injury to a particular person. By
- 25 repudiation of a causal role for cigarette smoking in

- 1 general they hope to avoid liability in particular
- 2 cases"; correct?
- 3 A. Again that's what it says here.
- 4 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the answers that
- 5 you've given today here are an attempt to repudiate
- 6 the causal role of cigarette smoking in hopes to
- 7 avoid liability in this case?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 9 answered.
- 10 A. And the answer again is no.
- 11 Q. Now, sir, this document goes on to say "This
- 12 domination by legal consideration thus leads the
- 13 industry into a public rejection in total of any
- 14 causal relationship between smoking and disease and
- 15 puts the industry in a" particular "position with
- 16 respect to product safety discussions, safety
- 17 evaluations, collaborative" -- "collaborative
- 18 research et cetera"; correct?
- MR. SHEFFLER: It says actually "peculiar,"
- 20 not "particular."
- 21 A. Yes, it does say "peculiar," but other than
- 22 that, that's what it says in this document.
- 23 Q. All right. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that your
- 24 answers today when I asked you about smoking and lung
- 25 cancer were dominated by this very consideration

- 1 that's set out in this document, Exhibit 443?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 3 answered.
- 4 A. And again, the answer is absolutely not. My --
- 5 my statements to you are based on considerations of
- 6 science, not any legal matters.
- 7 Q. Now, sir, it goes on in the paragraph to say
- 8 "The industry has retreated behind impossible
- 9 demands for, " quote, "'scientific proof, '" quote,
- 10 "whereas such proof has never been required as a
- 11 basis for action in the legal and political fields";
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. Again that's what it says in this document.
- 14 Q. And isn't that exactly what your answer to these
- 15 ladies and gentlemen of the jury did today, was
- 16 retreat behind an impossible demand for scientific
- 17 proof?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection,
- 19 mischaracterization of the prior testimony.
- 20 A. And the -- and the answer is absolutely not.
- 21 What I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ -- what I said in my statement is that -- for
- 22 example, let's take lung cancer. We believe that
- 23 smoking's an important risk factor of lung cancer.
- 24 We acknowledge and re -- respect public health
- 25 authorities' judgment that smoking is a cause of lung

- 1 cancer. We, along with many other people, continue
- 2 to investigate what the biological mechanisms may be
- 3 related to -- to lung cancer.
- 4 I mean, it's clearly the fact, whatever this
- 5 document says, is that British-American Tobacco
- 6 Company has worked in collaboration with governments,
- 7 with academic scientists in trying to elucidate what
- 8 may be the biological mechanisms for lung cancer, and
- 9 as an -- an example of where that research continues,
- 10 there was a paper last year in the Journal of Science
- 11 by a scientist called Dennisenko that suggested that
- 12 they for the first time identified a biological link
- 13 between a substance in tobacco smoke and lung
- 14 cancer. I think that is evidence that that research
- 15 continues today in a -- in a laboratory setting to
- 16 try and find what may be responsible for the
- 17 association. In fact, the Dennisenko study didn't
- 18 reach that, but the research continues today, and
- 19 we're certainly active in -- in assisting the -- the
- 20 general academic thrust in this area.
- 21 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that basically all of your
- 22 answers lead back to the fact that you're trying to
- 23 not acknowledge causation because of the legal
- 24 consequences?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This has been

- 1 asked and answered repeatedly.
- 2 A. And again the answer is absolutely not.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 4 Exhibit 444.
- 5 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 444 was handed
- 6 to the witness.)
- 7 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 10 as Exhibit 444, this is entitled "THE CREDIBILITY OF
- 11 THE INDUSTRY STANCE"; correct?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Do you have another copy?
- MS. WIVELL: (Shaking head.)
- 14 A. At the top of this document it's marked "(2) THE
- 15 CREDIBILITY OF THE INDUSTRY STANCE." I assume
- 16 there's earlier pages to this, but they're not
- 17 present here.
- 18 Q. Sir, the second paragraph says "But, because all
- 19 arguments eventually lead back to the primary issue
- 20 of the legal consequences of acknowledging causation,
- 21 the industry now finds itself unable to argue
- 22 satisfactorily for its own successful continuity";
- 23 correct?
- MR. SHEFFLER: I would request that the
- 25 next paragraph be -- be read into the record to put

- 1 it in proper context.
- 2 She doesn't have to do that. That's -- my
- 3 objection is -- is for the record for the court to
- 4 rule upon at a later time, so if she's not going to
- 5 do it, you have to answer the question.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 7 A. My answer to the question is that, yes, what you
- 8 have read there is correct, and the document goes on
- 9 to say that "It is probably well acknowledged by the
- 10 majority of the informed public and Government bodies
- 11 that the cigarette industry, in many areas of the
- 12 world, has made major strides in reducing smoke
- 13 deliveries and, inter alia, in the nature of the
- 14 smoke condensate. What is clearly not understood (or
- 15 accepted), is the industry's apparent rigid rejection
- 16 of causation."
- 17 And I think -- I mean, I haven't read the rest
- 18 of this document, but that clearly goes to the fact
- 19 that research has most clearly continued to try and
- 20 elucidate what the statistical associations have
- 21 shown.
- 22 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 590 was marked
- for identification.)
- 24 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 25 Q. Sir, showing you --

- 1 A. Thanks.
- 2 Q. -- what's been marked as Plaintiffs'
- 3 Exhibit 590, these are the Responses and Objections
- 4 of B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. to Plaintiffs' First Set
- 5 of Requests for Admissions to B.A.T. Industries
- 6 P.L.C.; correct?
- 7 A. That's what it says on the first page here.
- 8 Q. All right. If you look at the first request,
- 9 plaintiffs asked that B.A.T. Industries admit that
- 10 smoking causes cancer; correct?
- 11 A. It says "Request Number 1. Admit that smoking
- 12 causes cancer."
- 13 Q. And the last sentence of the response to Request
- 14 Number 1 is "BAT Industries, therefore, denies that
- 15 it has been scientifically established that cigarette
- 16 smoking causes cancer and denies Request Number 1";
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Yeah, the whole sentence or the whole response
- 19 reads "BAT Industries objects to Request Number 1 on
- 20 the ground that it is vague and ambiguous. Smoking
- 21 is widely reported as a risk factor for certain types
- 22 of cancer. Numerous other factors are also reported
- 23 to be risk factors for cancer, including but not
- 24 limited to" -- "limited to genetic, environmental,
- 25 social and behavioral factors. The causes of cancer

- 1 are complex and have not been scientifically
- 2 established. BAT Industries, therefore, denies that
- 3 it has been scientifically established that cigarette
- 4 smoking causes cancer and denies Request Number 1."
- 5 Q. And, sir, if we ask that question today, the
- 6 answer would be the same, wouldn't it?
- 7 A. This was asked fairly recently. I would imagine
- 8 that the answer would be the same in terms of the
- 9 question that's asked, which, I mean, I agree is
- 10 pretty vague and ambiguous and doesn't really allow
- 11 the full description of -- of what is a very complex
- 12 issue.
- 13 Q. Well what is vague and ambiguous about "smoking
- 14 causes cancer, " sir?
- 15 A. Because a "yes," "no" or very short response to
- 16 that request, it doesn't fully respect what is a very
- 17 complex issue, and the complex issue is related to
- 18 the amount of research effort that is continuing in
- 19 terms of trying to identify biological mechanisms.
- 20 Q. All that research over all those years and no
- 21 one's come up with a mechanism yet; is that right?
- 22 A. I mean, that -- that is clearly correct, and you
- 23 could ask anyone from the National Cancer Institute,
- 24 I guess, or -- or whoever. That's pure speculation,
- 25 but I mean, it's very clear if -- if you look to

- 1 academic research around the world there is still a
- 2 tremendous amount of effort trying to identify
- 3 biological mechanisms for -- for lung cancer.
- 4 Q. The --
- 5 The how of how cigarettes cause lung cancer;
- 6 right?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 8 question. It's --
- 9 A. No, it's -- it's not the how. And in fact, I
- 10 mean, what research is undertaken is -- is the
- 11 fundamentals, and frankly it's not just smoking.
- 12 There still is not the understanding that is required
- 13 in terms of why lung cancer occurs in any individual
- 14 and exactly what happens through the progression of
- 15 someone getting lung cancer. It's a fundamental
- 16 scientific question that, for example, the
- 17 International Agency for Research on Cancer based on
- 18 Lyon -- based in Lyon in France continue to
- 19 investigate.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, it's a fact, isn't it, that the
- 21 majority of scientists around the world believe that
- 22 smoking causes lung cancer; right?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 24 A. It would be speculation because I haven't done a
- 25 survey of the majority of scientists. It would

- 1 certainly be true to state that the majority and
- 2 perhaps all governments and public health authorities
- 3 have taken the view that smoking is a cause of lung
- 4 cancer. That's quite understandable given what
- 5 information they have to make their judgment, which
- 6 is primarily epidemiological, and that the fact that
- 7 the public health authorities have to make some sort
- 8 of judgment one way or the other.
- 9 Q. Now, sir, the next request asks that B.A.T.
- 10 Industries admit that smoking causes heart disease;
- 11 right?
- 12 A. Yes, it says "Request Number 2. Admit that
- 13 smoking causes heart disease."
- 14 Q. And B.A.T. Industries denied that smoking causes
- 15 lung cancer -- or I'm sorry, that smoking causes
- 16 heart disease, didn't it?
- 17 A. Well the response to Request Number 2 is "BAT
- 18 Industries objects to Request Number 2 on the ground
- 19 that it is vague and ambiguous. Smoking is widely
- 20 reported as a risk factor for certain types of heart
- 21 disease. Numerous other factors are also reported to
- 22 be risk factors for heart disease, including but not
- 23 limited to genetic, environmental, social and
- 24 behavioral factors. The "cause "of heart disease" --
- 25 or "the causes of heart disease," I'm sorry, "are

- 1 complex and have not been scientifically
- 2 established. BAT Industries, therefore, denies that
- 3 it has been scientifically established that cigarette
- 4 smoking causes heart disease and denies Request
- 5 Number 2."
- 6 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that most of the
- 7 governments throughout the world believe that
- 8 cigarette smoking causes heart disease?
- 9 A. I think the view of the majority of governments
- 10 around the world is that smoking is one of the causes
- 11 of heart disease, alongside cholesterol and alongside
- 12 things like diet in general.
- 13 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the vast majority of
- 14 scientists throughout the world believe that smoking
- 15 causes heart disease?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad.
- 17 A. And again, I mean, I have not done a survey of
- 18 all the scientists around the world, and my guess is
- 19 that actually if you -- and I don't know how you'd
- 20 term what a scientist is, but my guess is the
- 21 overwhelming majority of scientists haven't
- 22 considered this matter in any depth. Having said
- 23 that, it is most clear that the government and public
- 24 health authorities have made judgments on this
- 25 issue.

- 1 Q. All right. And do you believe that B.A.T.
- 2 Industries is in a better position than the public
- 3 health authorities, say, in the United States to
- 4 determine whether or not smoking causes heart
- 5 disease?
- 6 A. As I've said in -- in previous responses,
- 7 British-American Tobacco respects the views of public
- 8 health authorities. In practical terms what you find
- 9 is there is still considerable research going on,
- 10 some of which is sponsored by British-American
- 11 Tobacco, into understanding the fundamental
- 12 mechanisms related to lung cancer, related to heart
- 13 disease. And in practical terms, as you'll see
- 14 really, for example, in the collaboration that the
- 15 company has had with, for example, the British
- 16 government, what there has been is a -- a very
- 17 long-term serious research effort to see what could
- 18 be done about a product in order that there may be
- 19 changes that would be accepted by public health
- 20 authorities.
- 21 Q. Sir, move to strike as nonresponsive. That
- 22 wasn't my question.
- 23 My question is simply this: Is B.A.T.
- 24 Industries in a better position than the public
- 25 health authorities in the United States to determine

- 1 whether or not smoking causes heart disease?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to counsel's
- 3 statements. The question was asked and answered.
- 4 A. And -- and my response is it's actually in a
- 5 different position. Public health authorities have
- 6 to make a judgment and give a view to the public
- 7 based on the information they have. In terms of
- 8 British-American Tobacco, what we have to do is have
- 9 enough understanding, and -- and you see this yet
- 10 again if you refer to the kind of collaborative work
- 11 that the company has done with governments, an
- 12 understanding that would lead to a change in the
- 13 product that would be accepted as being beneficial by
- 14 public health authorities.
- 15 Q. Well I'm not sure that the jury would understand
- 16 what your answer is, sir. "Yes" or "no," is B.A.T.
- 17 Industries in a better position than the public
- 18 health authorities in the United States to determine
- 19 whether smoking causes lung disease?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 21 question, objection to counsel's statements and
- 22 objection to instruction to answer the question in
- 23 any particular way. The witness is entitled to
- 24 answer the question in the appropriate way.
- 25 A. And -- and my answer is that we're in a

- 1 different position. Public health authorities have
- 2 to give a view to their publics based on information
- 3 they have at hand. It is again still a fact that
- 4 there are governments around the world, certainly
- 5 including the U.K. government, I would imagine
- 6 including the U.S. government -- I'm not so familiar
- 7 with the situation here -- that are contributing to
- 8 fundamental scientific work to try and understand why
- 9 there are statistical relationships between smoking
- 10 and heart disease and smoking and lung cancer.
- 11 Q. Well you've told us, I think, that most of the
- 12 governments believe that cigarette smoking causes
- 13 heart disease. Is that a fair statement?
- 14 A. What I said was that if -- probably all
- 15 governments have considered this matter, have made a
- 16 judgment based on -- on what evidence they have at
- 17 hand that smoking is a cause of lung cancer and --
- 18 and smoking is one of the causes of heart disease.
- 19 Q. Now you would agree also that most of the
- 20 governments -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- You would agree, wouldn't you, that all of the
- 22 governments in the world also believe that cigarette
- 23 smoking causes arteriosclerosis? Right?
- 24 A. I mean, again, I mean, my general belief of
- 25 governments that have taken a view on this matter

- 1 from public health authorities is that they would be
- 2 of the view that smoking is a cause of
- 3 arteriosclerosis, you said?
- 4 Q. Yes, sir. And when the plaintiffs asked B.A.T.
- 5 Industries to admit that smoking caused
- 6 arteriosclerosis, what did B.A.T. say?
- 7 A. Well in response to that Request Number 3, the
- 8 response to Request Number 3 was, as stated in this
- 9 document, "BAT Industries objects to Request Number 3
- 10 on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous.
- 11 Smoking is widely reported as a risk factor for
- 12 certain types of arteriosclerosis. Numerous other
- 13 factors are also reported to be risk factors for
- 14 arteriosclerosis, including but not limited to
- 15 genetic, environmental, social and behavioral
- 16 factors. The causes of arteriosclerosis are complex
- 17 and have not been scientifically established. BAT
- 18 Industries, therefore, denies that it has been
- 19 scientifically established that cigarette smoking
- 20 causes arteriosclerosis and denies Request
- 21 Number 3."
- 22 Q. Now again here it says that in this answer
- 23 "BAT ... objects to Request Number 3 on the ground
- 24 that it is vague and ambiguous." Which of those
- 25 words are vague and ambiguous, "Admit that smoking

- 1 causes arteriosclerosis"? Which one?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 3 A. I mean, the question, as I tried to express it
- 4 before, is that it's trying to give a very simple
- 5 answer to what is a very complex area of research,
- 6 and -- and again, I mean, it is absolutely true that
- 7 public health authorities have made judgments based
- 8 on the information they have at their hand. The fact
- 9 is that research continues in lung cancer, in heart
- 10 disease -- disease, in arteriosclerosis, in trying to
- 11 determine exactly what happens in the human and as
- 12 they go through life and they're exposed to various
- 13 different things.
- 14 And so I think it's difficult to give a simple
- 15 answer to what is actually a very complex whole body
- 16 of science.
- 17 Q. But you would agree that despite the fact that
- 18 science is continuing to -- to figure out exactly
- 19 what happens in a human being, that these governments
- 20 have come to the conclusion that cigarette smoking
- 21 causes arteriosclerosis; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 23 answered.
- 24 A. On the basis of the information they have at
- 25 their hand and given what their responsibilities are,

- 1 which are to make judgments on the basis of that
- 2 information, that's -- that's the view they've come
- 3 to, and they've been very successful I think in
- 4 promoting that view.
- 5 Q. All right. Now, sir, the next request asks that
- 6 B.A.T. Industries admit that smoking causes strokes;
- 7 right?
- 8 A. Yes, it does.
- 9 Q. And what did B.A.T. respond to Plaintiffs'
- 10 request for that admission?
- 11 A. I can read that again. It says "Response to
- 12 Request Number 4. BAT Industries objects to Request
- 13 Number 4 on the ground that it is vague and
- 14 ambiguous. Smoking is widely reported as a risk
- 15 factor for certain types of strokes. Numerous other
- 16 factors are also reported to be risk factors for
- 17 strokes, including but not limited to genetic,
- 18 environmental, social and behavioral factors. The
- 19 causes of strokes are complex and have not been
- 20 scientifically established. BAT Industries,
- 21 therefore, denies that it has been scientifically
- 22 established that cigarette smoking causes strokes and
- 23 denies Request Number 4."
- 24 Q. Sir, you would agree that all governments who
- 25 have considered the subject believe that cigarette

- 1 smoking causes strokes?
- 2 A. It would be my view that, I mean, public health
- 3 authorities that have looked at this would take the
- 4 view that smoking is one of the causes of -- of
- 5 strokes.
- 6 Q. And they take that view despite the fact that
- 7 research on what actually happens in human beings who
- 8 smoke and have strokes is continuing; right?
- 9 A. I think that's correct, and I think that is just
- 10 what public health authorities do. No matter what
- 11 the subject, they base their information on what is
- 12 available to them at the time and need to make public
- 13 pronouncements on the basis of that information.
- 14 Q. Now, sir, the next request asks B.A.T.
- 15 Industries to admit that smoking causes emphysema;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. Yeah, it says "Request Number 5, Admit that
- 18 smoking causes emphysema."
- 19 Q. And again B.A.T. Industries denied that it has
- 20 been scientifically established that cigarette
- 21 smoking causes emphysema and denies Request Number 5;
- 22 right?
- 23 A. Yeah, it says "BAT Industries objects to Request
- 24 Number 5 on the ground that it is vague and
- 25 ambiguous. Smoking is widely reported as a risk

- 1 factor for certain types of emphysema. Numerous
- 2 other factors are also reported to be risk factors
- 3 for emphysema, including but not limited to genetic,
- 4 environmental, social and behavioral factors. The
- 5 causes of emphysema are complex and have not been
- 6 scientifically established, and BAT Industries,
- 7 therefore, denies that it has been scientifically
- 8 established that smoking -- cigarette smoking
- 9 causes emphysema and denies Request Number 5."
- 10 Q. Now, sir, every government who has addressed the
- 11 issue of whether cigarette smoking causes emphysema
- 12 has determined that it -- that cigarette smoking does
- 13 cause emphysema; isn't that true?
- 14 A. I believe that to be the case.
- 15 Q. And, sir, that is the case despite the fact that
- 16 research continues to go on about what actually
- 17 happens to people who smoke cigarettes and how
- 18 emphysema is formed; right?
- 19 A. And again my response is yes, public health
- 20 authorities have to make judgments based on -- on
- 21 whatever matter they are considering on the basis of
- 22 the information they have at their hand.
- 23 Q. Now, sir, the next request that plaintiffs asked
- 24 was that Defendant B.A.T. Industries admit smoking
- 25 causes chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; right?

- 1 A. That's right.
- 2 Q. And basically B.A.T. Industries denied that
- 3 cigarette smoking causes chronic obstructive
- 4 pulmonary disease; right?
- 5 A. Again it says "BAT Industries objects to Request
- 6 Number 6 on the ground that it is vague and
- 7 ambiguous. Smoking is widely reported as a risk
- 8 factor for certain types of chronic obstructive
- 9 pulmonary disease. Numerous other factors are also
- 10 reported to be risk factors for chronic obstructive
- 11 pulmonary disease, including but not limited to
- 12 genetic, environmental, social and behavioral
- 13 factors. The causes of chronic obstructive pulmonary
- 14 disease are complex and have not been scientifically
- 15 established. BAT Industries, therefore, denies that
- 16 it has been scientifically established that cigarette
- 17 smoking causes chronic obstructive pulmonary
- 18 disease"
- 19 Q. Now, sir, every government that's ever looked at
- 20 the issue of whether cigarette smoking causes chronic
- 21 obstructive pulmonary disease has come to the
- 22 conclusion that cigarette smoking does cause that;
- 23 right?
- 24 A. I think that is true. I don't know how many
- 25 governments have specifically considered this and the

- 1 other matters, but those that have I believe have
- 2 reached a view that smoking is a cause of chronic
- 3 obstructive pulmonary disease.
- 4 Q. And, sir, that they came to that view despite
- 5 the fact that research is continuing on the subject
- 6 of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; right?
- 7 A. I gather that is the case, yes.
- 8 Q. All right. Now let me ask you this: Does
- 9 B.A.T. Industries currently have any in-house
- 10 research ongoing concerning the cause of chronic
- 11 obstructive pulmonary disease?
- 12 A. We have a variety of research that we sponsor in
- 13 relation to a variety of diseases. Your question I
- 14 know was -- was in-house. In terms of research
- 15 undertaken in our research laboratories, I don't
- 16 think the answer would be yes. But for certainly in
- 17 terms of the types of independent research that we
- 18 continue to fund, the answer is yes.
- 19 Q. All right. Well again focusing on just in-house
- 20 research, does B.A.T. Industries have any in-house
- 21 research ongoing today on whether cigarette smoking
- 22 causes emphysema?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Do you --
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to form, foundation.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Are you asking B.A.T.

- 1 Industries or BATCO?
- 2 MS. WIVELL: B.A.T. Industries.
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Oh, sorry.
- 4 A. Well let me respond in terms of British-American
- 5 Tobacco Company, who are the people that undertake
- 6 such research, and again, I mean, in-house there is
- 7 research looking certainly at product modifications
- 8 in terms of understanding biological mechanisms --
- 9 and maybe I can save some time here -- in relation to
- 10 emphysema, in relation to heart disease and in
- 11 relation to lung cancer.
- 12 Much of that research would take place external
- 13 to the company, and we would be supporting that
- 14 research. The reason for that is that a lot of the
- 15 research areas involved in this are highly complex.
- 16 We would be looking at molecular biology typically,
- 17 and you require very specialized and sophisticated
- 18 equipment to be doing that. It makes far more sense
- 19 given the breadth of the types of research that's
- 20 required for us to be contributing to the scientific
- 21 community rather than try and bring everything
- 22 in-house.
- 23 Q. All right. So just so we're clear here, it
- 24 would be fair to say that right now there is no
- 25 B.A.T. Industries company, subsidiary company, that

- 1 is doing work on -- in-house on the causing --
- 2 causation -- strike that.
- 3 It would be fair to say that today there is no
- 4 B.A.T. Industries subsidiary which is doing in-house
- 5 work addressing the subject specifically of whether
- 6 smoking causes cancer?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 8 A. And -- and the response again is that I can't
- 9 distinguish in-house from -- from external because
- 10 it's the same pot of information. Clearly what we do
- 11 is contribute to the external academic environment,
- 12 trying to identify the mechanisms related to diseases
- 13 such as lung cancer. What we do internally is -- is
- 14 investigate a variety of things which may have some
- 15 impact on that.
- 16 But the fundamental to try and understand the
- 17 biological mechanisms, trying to identify at this
- 18 point in time exactly what those -- those genetic
- 19 mechanisms may be are really -- we are focusing upon
- 20 the universities at the forefront of that science in
- 21 terms of trying to make breakthroughs.
- 22 Q. But just so we're clear here, if I went through
- 23 each one of these requests to admit Numbers 1 through
- 24 6 and asked you whether research was being done
- 25 in-house at any B.A.T. Group company on that issue,

- 1 the answer would be no, wouldn't it?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The answer would
- 3 be what the answer was when you've asked the question
- 4 before. Objection, asked and answered.
- 5 A. And the answer is that the majority of our
- 6 thrust on -- on the leading edge of identifying
- 7 biological mechanisms is -- is through the -- the
- 8 contribution to the general academic environment by
- 9 trying to identify biological mechanisms. That is
- 10 not to say that we don't continue to do research
- 11 in-house which -- which may be helpful to that in
- 12 terms of trying to identify biological tests, in
- 13 terms of continuing to try and understand the smoke
- 14 chemistry.
- 15 But the -- the fundamental -- I think the
- 16 fundamental breakthrough will come in top
- 17 universities, who are really starting to understand
- 18 the genetics of the human body and biological
- 19 mechanisms which may be related to disease.
- 20 Q. But, sir, you can't as you sit here today direct
- 21 us to one single ongoing study that in-house is
- 22 directed at addressing the specific issue of whether
- 23 smoking causes any one of these diseases, can you?
- 24 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 25 mischaracterizes testimony. Go ahead.

- 1 A. And again it goes to, I mean, exactly what you
- 2 mean in terms of a broad scope of -- of research
- 3 related to these matters. What is clear -- and you
- 4 can't distinguish in-house from external and --
- 5 excuse me. It is clear what happens is that where
- 6 fundamental breakthroughs in the science, this
- 7 complex science, are going to happen is external, and
- 8 I think there is a clear link between those working
- 9 in-house with those external researchers doing
- 10 evaluation of this issue.
- 11 So I really don't see from my point of view that
- 12 where the research is done is -- is a matter of -- of
- 13 consequence as long as that research has been
- 14 undertaken.
- 15 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 16 Sir, can you direct me to one single project
- 17 that is going on in-house at any B.A.T. Group company
- 18 today that addresses the issue of whether smoking
- 19 causes any of these diseases?
- 20 A. If your request is looking at biological
- 21 mechanisms specifically, then the answer is no,
- 22 because we contribute to the scientific community,
- 23 who are expert in that area.
- MS. WIVELL: Why don't we take our lunch
- 25 break.

1	THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
2	(Luncheon recess taken at 12:18 o'clock
3	p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 AFTERNOON SESSION
- 2 (Deposition reconvened at 1:43 o'clock
- 3 p.m.)
- 4 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 5 Q. Sir, you have Exhibit 590 in front of you.
- 6 That's the Responses and Objections of B.A.T.
- 7 Industries to the Requests for Admissions that we
- 8 were talking about; right?
- 9 A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. Now, sir, is the position that B.A.T. Industries
- 11 has taken in Exhibit 590 a reasonable one with regard
- 12 to the first six requests for admission?
- 13 A. It's my --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to form.
- 15 A. It's my view that it's -- it's reasonable in
- 16 terms of -- of -- of where the science stands, and I
- 17 think the responses to each of the questions reflects
- 18 the fact that there are complex scientific issues
- 19 still being explored.
- 20 Q. Now, sir, would it be reasonable for others to
- 21 believe that it has not been proven that cigarette
- 22 smoking causes lung cancer?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 24 A. It depends who you are talking to. I mean, it's
- 25 very clear that the public health authorities have --

- 1 have -- have given a view that they believe that
- 2 smoking causes lung cancer on the basis of the
- 3 information they have before them, and they've
- 4 certainly made very clear what their view is. If you
- 5 ask a scientist in a university who's trying to
- 6 understand what the biological mechanisms are related
- 7 to lung cancer in general, I'm sure, I mean, they
- 8 will tell you there is still more to be understood.
- 9 Q. All right. And it would be, therefore,
- 10 reasonable for smokers to believe that it has not
- 11 been firmly established that cigarette causes
- 12 smoking -- that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer;
- 13 right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 15 A. I think it's -- it's not reasonable in that, I
- 16 mean, my experience, certainly particularly in the
- 17 U.K. but in other countries around the world, is
- 18 that, as far as I'm aware, not just smokers but the
- 19 population in general are very well aware of what the
- 20 public health authorities have said, and my guess is
- 21 if you -- if you ask people, for example, in the
- 22 United Kingdom what their view is, the view that they
- 23 will give you is that smoking is -- is a cause of
- 24 lung cancer on the basis of what they've heard for
- 25 many years from public health authorities, from

- 1 governments and from physicians.
- 2 Q. All right. I move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 3 My question was a little different, sir.
- 4 It would be reasonable, wouldn't it, for smokers
- 5 to believe, as B.A.T. Industries does, that it has
- 6 not been scientifically established that cigarette
- 7 smoking causes cancer?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 9 answered.
- 10 A. And again I think, I mean, in the real world
- 11 what -- what you'll find is that people, smokers and
- 12 nonsmokers, would have -- would have heard and the
- 13 prevalent view which has been promoted through
- 14 various routes that the public health authorities and
- 15 governments believe that smoking is a cause of lung
- 16 cancer.
- 17 Q. Well putting aside the public health authorities
- 18 for a moment, you would agree, wouldn't you, that it
- 19 would be fair that if B.A.T. Industries believes that
- 20 it's reasonable to deny that it has been
- 21 scientifically established that cigarette smoking
- 22 causes cancer, that it would similarly be reasonable
- 23 for a smoker to believe that?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 25 question. Objection, asked and answered.

- 1 A. And -- and yet again you can't put aside what
- 2 the public health authorities said because I think
- 3 that's the way most people would -- would -- would
- 4 take their views. There would be very few people in
- 5 the general population looking at the scientific
- 6 matters related. What they would do is listen to the
- 7 general information that they receive and make their
- 8 judgments upon that.
- 9 Q. Well, sir, have you seen surveys that were --
- 10 have been done by the tobacco industry on whether or
- 11 not smokers are informed about these scientific
- 12 facts?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 14 assumes facts not in evidence.
- 15 A. I've seen surveys from, for example, the United
- 16 States Surgeon General years back which -- which have
- 17 said that most people in the United States obviously
- 18 because it's U.S. Surgeon General believe that
- 19 smoking is a cause of lung cancer, presumably because
- 20 of what they've heard from the public health
- 21 authorities.
- 22 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 23 question didn't have anything to do with public
- 24 health authorities.
- 25 My question is this: Have you seen surveys done

- 1 by the tobacco industry on whether or not smokers are
- 2 informed about the scientific facts concerning
- 3 smoking and -- and health?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 5 answered.
- 6 A. And the response is that no, I haven't, but
- 7 there's no need for those since, I mean, it's been
- 8 clear -- and again I respond by looking at the U.S.
- 9 Surgeon General's report that, I mean, in surveys
- 10 undertaken by -- by people in the academic community,
- 11 it's pretty clear that people are aware of the views
- 12 promoted by the public health authorities.
- 13 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the tobacco industry
- 14 itself has done public surveys that showed that
- 15 cigarette smokers were not fully informed and well
- 16 aware?
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad.
- 18 Objection, assumes facts not in evidence.
- 19 A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.
- 20 Q. Certainly. Isn't it a fact that the tobacco
- 21 industry itself has done public surveys that showed
- 22 that cigarette smokers were not fully informed about
- 23 the association between smoking and disease?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Same objections.
- 25 A. I haven't seen such surveys, but what I have

- 1 seen is clearly what -- what is out in the public
- 2 domain coming from the public health authorities. I
- 3 would be surprised if there were to be such surveys
- 4 that they would give any different findings from
- 5 those, for example, undertaken by the U.S. Surgeon
- 6 General.
- 7 Q. Well isn't it a fact, sir, that a survey done by
- 8 the tobacco industry itself showed smokers were not
- 9 fully informed about the association between smoking
- 10 and disease and that the results of that study were
- 11 actually destroyed?
- 12 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, assumes facts not
- 13 in evidence, mischaracterizes the testimony of the
- 14 witness, objection to the form.
- 15 A. I'm absolutely unaware of such a study and, you
- 16 know, so it would be pure speculation as -- as to
- 17 your question. I mean, my view is that from what
- 18 I've seen from the scientific literature and from
- 19 public health authorities, it is clear and has been
- 20 for many years that -- that people are aware of what
- 21 people say, what the public health authorities say
- 22 on -- on the issue of smoking and health.
- 23 MS. WIVELL: I would just like the record
- 24 to reflect that at this point I would like to
- 25 cross-examine the witness with a document that the

- 1 defendants have claimed as work product or privileged
- 2 in the Minnesota litigation, but which was disclosed
- 3 in the Florida litigation and which is available on
- 4 the Internet, but because of our agreement and
- 5 directions from the court, I am not able to use that
- 6 document which directly impeaches this witness's
- 7 testimony. And so I'm going to make that statement
- 8 for the record and then hope that we will have the
- 9 document so that it can be read in at this point if
- 10 this testimony is ever played to the jury.
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to the -- I object
- 12 to the statement by counsel. I further object that
- 13 there is no grounds for impeachment. The witness has
- 14 testified repeatedly he's -- he's aware of no such
- 15 study which counsel claims exists, and there is no
- 16 grounds for any such impeachment.
- 17 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 18 Q. Sir, isn't it reasonable -- I'm sorry, strike
- 19 that.
- 20 Now B.A.T. Industries has also denied in these
- 21 Requests for Admissions that smoking causes heart
- 22 disease. Isn't it -- or wouldn't it be fair for
- 23 smokers to believe that it has not been
- 24 scientifically established that cigarette smoking
- 25 causes heart disease as B.A.T. Industries says in

- 1 Exhibit 590?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 3 A. I think in terms of the real world, that's not a
- 4 fair assumption. I would believe that again most
- 5 adults -- well most people would be aware of what
- 6 public health authorities have said in relation to
- 7 heart disease, and I think it's -- it's generally
- 8 known what -- where public authorities come out on
- 9 heart disease, that there's a variety in their belief
- 10 of causes, including smoking, but also a variety of
- 11 other factors too.
- 12 Q. Now, sir, you would agree that tobacco is a
- 13 legal product to sell, isn't it?
- 14 A. As far as I know, in every country in the world,
- 15 as cigarettes are legal, and therefore I guess
- 16 tobacco is legal.
- 17 Q. All right. Well you would also agree that it is
- 18 improper to sell a legal product through illegal
- 19 means, wouldn't you?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form as
- 21 overbroad.
- 22 A. I mean, I'm not sure what you mean by "illegal
- 23 means," but presumably whatever the laws are in a
- 24 particular country, you would sell by them. I'm not
- 25 sure I'm --

- 1 Q. All right.
- 2 A. -- I'm answering your question because I'm not
- 3 sure I understand the question.
- 4 Q. Well let me try and help you a little bit here.
- 5 It's illegal in the state of Minnesota, it's a
- 6 violation of the Consumer Protection Statute, to use
- 7 misstatements to sell a product. Now if that's the
- 8 case, it would be improper to use misstatements to
- 9 sell cigarettes, wouldn't it?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 11 A. I mean, I don't know the Minnesota -- Minnesota
- 12 law. I would have thought, I mean, generally, I
- 13 mean, any statements shouldn't be misstatements,
- 14 whatever the matter is.
- 15 Q. Okay. It would be improper if any of the B.A.T.
- 16 Group companies made untrue statements in selling
- 17 cigarettes to smokers, wouldn't it?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 19 answered.
- 20 A. I mean, again I'm not sure what the question
- 21 refers to, but, I mean, as I said previously, I would
- 22 not expect and it's a view of British-American
- 23 Tobacco that there should be not -- there should not
- 24 be misstatements made.
- 25 Q. All right. And it would be improper if there

- 1 were misstatements, wouldn't it?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, asked
- 3 and answered.
- 4 A. Again, I mean, I have -- I would need to have a
- 5 bit more information to respond more specifically to
- 6 your question. If it's a generic that
- 7 British-American Tobacco and -- and any other company
- 8 should speak as accurately as possible, the answer is
- 9 yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. Well isn't it true that the B.A.T. Group
- 11 decided it would try and influence medical and
- 12 scientific attitudes and opinions regarding smoking
- 13 and health?
- 14 A. I think on several of the documents you showed
- 15 me this morning give that sort of suggestion. In
- 16 reality, if you look through the history of -- of
- 17 British-American Tobacco, what you'll find is that
- 18 what the company has done is worked in cooperation
- 19 with governments, and certainly in terms of the
- 20 public views in relation to smoking and health, what
- 21 you'll find is -- is clearly the predominant view
- 22 that people take is that of the public health
- 23 authorities. And I see that ${\tt British-American}$
- 24 Tobacco's action over the many years has been
- 25 responsible in those matters.

- 1 Q. Well, move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 2 Sir, my question is simply this: Didn't B.A.T.
- 3 Industries decide that it was -- it would try and
- 4 influence medical and scientific attitudes and
- 5 opinions regarding smoking and health?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: The precise question was
- 7 asked and answered.
- 8 A. British-American Tobacco has worked with
- 9 governments and medical bodies and academic
- 10 researchers for many years in terms of trying to
- 11 understand things in relation to smoking and health.
- 12 If you are saying has British-American Tobacco gone
- 13 forward and try and convince someone of -- of an
- 14 opinion which is not their own, the answer is no, but
- 15 I think that what you'll see from what
- 16 British-American Tobacco has done is work very much
- 17 in collaboration. I mean, perhaps the best example
- 18 is in -- in the U.K. where we have decades of
- 19 collaboration with the government working towards
- 20 product modifications.
- 21 Q. Sir, I'm going to move to strike as
- 22 nonresponsive again.
- 23 Isn't it a fact that B.A.T. Industries tried not
- 24 just to work with the governmental authorities, but
- 25 to influence medical and scientific attitudes and

- 1 opinions?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form of the
- 3 question, asked and answered. Object to -- well
- 4 object to the form of the question, asked and
- 5 answered.
- 6 A. And -- and again, as far as I know, knowing what
- 7 the facts are, if you look at the views of public
- 8 health authorities and medical authorities, their --
- 9 their views are -- are very clear. They've given
- 10 those statements very clearly, and so even
- 11 hypothetically, if your question were to be accurate,
- 12 it clearly has not been the case that public health
- 13 authorities have -- have given any other view to the
- 14 public other than the ones that are very well known.
- 15 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact, contrary to your
- 16 testimony, that B.A.T. directed its companies to go
- 17 out and seek prospects for product reassurance and
- 18 marketing throughout the world?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form of the
- 20 question, overbroad.
- 21 A. No. I think what British-American Tobacco has
- 22 done -- and it's clear from some of the documents we
- 23 saw this morning -- is to have a philosophy whereby
- 24 we should work with governments. We don't make
- 25 health claims about products, but -- but clearly

- 1 public health authorities may well do so. And again,
- 2 for example, in the United Kingdom, we have decades
- 3 of research where we worked with the government and
- 4 the public health authorities there looking at
- 5 product modifications which may be deemed by the
- 6 public health authorities as being beneficial.
- 7 Q. So it's your testimony that B.A.T. never went
- 8 out and tried to reinsure -- reassure smokers about
- 9 their -- their smoking habits?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection as to the form of
- 11 the question, overbroad.
- 12 A. It's my testimony that I -- I see no evidence
- 13 that British-American Tobacco has significantly
- 14 reassured any smokers and that the predominance of
- 15 information in -- predominance of information that
- 16 people take as to whether they choose to smoke or not
- 17 comes from the public health authorities.
- 18 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that from the chairman of
- 19 B.A.T. Industries down there was a policy to reassure
- 20 smokers about their habit?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 22 question, asked and answered.
- 23 A. Well the fact is no, and I can certainly go
- 24 particularly into my own experience that when I speak
- 25 in public in relation to these matters, I speak

- 1 accurately, and -- and certainly my impression is
- 2 that in terms of the general public, the public's
- 3 views are formed from what they hear from the public
- 4 health authorities.
- 5 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 591 was marked
- for identification.)
- 7 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 10 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 591, this is a document Bates
- 11 numbered 100427791; right?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. And if you look at the first page, it is from
- 14 P. L. Short; right?
- 15 A. Yeah, it's a letter from P. L. Short. I'm not
- 16 sure quite who it's to.
- 17 Q. It says "The agreements reached at the first and
- 18 second Conferences on Marketing in the 1980's, held
- 19 in October 1976 and March 1977, have been approved by
- 20 Mr. Sheehy"; correct?
- 21 A. That's what it says.
- 22 Q. All right. Mr. Sheehy was the chairman at the
- 23 time of B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., wasn't he, sir?
- 24 A. I'm not certain whether as to that date
- 25 Mr. Sheehy was the chairman of B.A.T. Industries. I

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 know at some stage he certainly was. I'm not
- 2 familiar --
- 3 Q. He --
- 4 A. -- whether at that date whether he was or not.
- 5 Q. He was the chair for a time period that spanned
- 6 two decades, didn't he -- wasn't he?
- 7 A. The chairman of --
- 8 MR. FRANKEL: Object to the form.
- 9 A. -- B.A.T. Industries, I'm -- I'm really not
- 10 certain of those facts.
- 11 Q. All right. Well, sir, it attaches a copy of a
- 12 document that had been approved by Mr. Sheehy,
- 13 doesn't it?
- 14 A. I'll have to look at the document. May I have a
- 15 little bit of time just to read through it?
- 16 Q. Well I'm going to direct you to a few pages, but
- 17 it says in the second sentence of the first paragraph
- 18 of the first page "I enclose a copy for you, dated
- 19 14.4.77"; right?
- 20 A. It certainly says "I enclose a copy for you,
- 21 dated 14.4.77."
- 22 Q. All right. And if you turn to the last page of
- 23 Exhibit 591, you see that the date of the attachment
- 24 is April 14th, 1977; right?
- 25 A. Yeah, there's a date at the bottom of this

- 1 document that says "14th April 1977."
- 2 Q. All right. Sir, would you turn to the first
- 3 page of the attachment. That is entitled "SMOKING &
- 4 HEALTH ITEM 7: THE EFFECT ON MARKETING"; correct?
- 5 A. Yeah, it says "SMOKING & HEALTH ITEM 7 : THE
- 6 EFFECT ON MARKETING."
- 7 Q. And if you go down to the third paragraph, there
- 8 is a heading entitled "Future Prospects"; right?
- 9 A. Yeah, it's noted "(1) Future Prospects."
- 10 Q. Then it says at the end of that paragraph "This
- 11 means ... B.A.T. will not remain on the defensive, by
- 12 simply reacting to alleged, " quote, "'health,'"
- 13 quote, "hazards and related competitive challenges:
- 14 instead, we" will -- "we shall actively seek out all
- 15 worthwhile prospects for brand and product
- 16 reassurance in marketing throughout the world";
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. That's what it says in this document.
- 19 Q. All right. Would you please turn to the page
- 20 that ends with Bates number 799.
- 21 A. Uh-huh.
- 22 Q. And there do you see the heading "TACTICS"?
- 23 A. Yeah, it's noted "B. TACTICS."
- 24 Q. And then it says "The main objective for all
- 25 tactics on publicity is directed towards achieving

- 1 reassurance among -- amongst a variety of, quote,
- 2 "'publics,'" quote, "including smokers particularly,
- 3 in the face of the increasing social unacceptability
- 4 of smoking." Did I read it correctly?
- 5 A. Yeah, you --
- 6 Q. And --
- 7 A. -- read that correctly.
- 8 Q. And "reassurance" is underlined in that
- 9 paragraph; isn't that true?
- 10 A. It is on this copy of the document, yeah.
- 11 Q. Yeah. And as a matter of fact, it talks about
- 12 reassuring smokers in the face of controversy
- 13 concerning cigarettes; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: I object to that question.
- 15 If counsel's going to ask for the witness to
- 16 interpret the document, he has asked for a chance to
- 17 read it. If you want to read him things and ask if
- 18 you read correctly, that's -- I have no objection to
- 19 that, but if you're going to ask him to interpret
- 20 what's said, then you should at least give him the
- 21 opportunity to read it, as he's requested.
- 22 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that the B.A.T.
- 23 Group's objective as far as public communication was
- 24 to reassure smokers about cigarettes and their
- 25 smoking habits?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Are you asking him with
- 2 respect to this document or are you asking for his
- 3 opinions? I object to the form of the question.
- 4 It's ambiguous.
- 5 A. I mean, I can answer that as a matter of what my
- 6 view is of what British-American Tobacco have done.
- 7 If -- if the specifics relate to this document, I do
- 8 need to read that to give you a view.
- 9 Q. Well, sir, could you turn to the top of the
- 10 third page -- I'm sorry, top of the fourth page of
- 11 the document, which starts with the number three.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. There it says "Communication," doesn't it?
- 14 A. Yes, it says "(b) Communication."
- 15 Q. And it says "All work in this area should be
- 16 directed towards providing consumer reassurance about
- 17 cigarettes and the smoking habit"; right?
- 18 A. That's what it says there.
- 19 Q. And then it goes on to talk about ways in which
- 20 this consumer reassurance about cigarettes and
- 21 smoking can be done; right?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Again, if you
- 23 want -- if you're going to ask him to interpret the
- 24 document, then you should give him the opportunity to
- 25 read it, as he's requested. If you're going to read

- 1 to him and ask him if you've read correctly, I have
- 2 no objection to that, but if you want him to give an
- 3 interpretation of what's in the document, he should
- 4 be entitled to read it.
- 5 A. And -- and again my views are, I mean, I can
- 6 read bits out of this document. I don't know exactly
- 7 what this document is. It's from a -- a Mr. P. L.
- 8 Short and --
- 9 Q. Well you --
- 10 A. -- I'm not sure it's -- who it's to. I can give
- 11 you a view as to what I believe British-American
- 12 Tobacco's position has been for many years and -- and
- 13 I can give you a view that it is not my belief that
- 14 the company has given reassurance to -- to smokers in
- 15 any shape or form. And it's my belief that people in
- 16 the general public have been influenced by what the
- 17 public health authorities have said.
- 18 I can -- I would be more than happy to try and
- 19 help you on this document, but I -- I really would
- 20 need the opportunity to read this document.
- 21 Q. Well P. L. Short was the BATCO marketing manager
- 22 for a number of years, wasn't he?
- 23 A. I don't know whether that's the case or not.
- 24 Q. All right. You just don't know as you sit here
- 25 one way or the other, do you?

- 1 A. That's what I said.
- 2 Q. All right. Now, this document at the top of the
- 3 page we were just looking at goes on to talk about
- 4 methods by which smokers can be reassured; isn't that
- 5 true, sir?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: I --
- 7 Q. Why don't you take a moment and read the
- 8 paragraph.
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Well I -- I object. If
- 10 the -- if -- excuse me, Counselor, but if the witness
- 11 needs to review more than a paragraph to answer your
- 12 question, then he's entitled to do that.
- 13 Q. Go ahead, you can read the paragraph.
- 14 A. Well I can read you the paragraph. I'm not sure
- 15 I'm going to be able to help you very much in terms
- 16 of, I mean, giving you a proper interpretation of --
- 17 of how this paragraph sits within what I believe
- 18 is -- is -- is the actions of British-American
- 19 Tobacco over the years. If you wish, I can certainly
- 20 read this, but I'm not sure it's going to help you
- 21 particularly in terms of a helpful answer.
- 22 Q. Well the rest of this paragraph from this
- 23 document entitled "SMOKING & HEALTH ITEM 7 : THE
- 24 EFFECT OF MARKETING" goes on to say "This can be
- 25 provided in different ways, e.g. by claimed low

- 1 deliveries, by the perception of low deliveries and
- 2 by the perception of 'mildness.'" Have I read that
- 3 correctly so far?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Let the record reflect that
- 5 "mildness" is in quotes.
- 6 A. Other than that, yes, you've read it correctly.
- 7 Q. Sir, and isn't it a fact that
- 8 British-American -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 9 Isn't it a fact that the B.A.T. Group did
- 10 attempt to reassure smokers by claiming low
- 11 deliveries of cigarettes?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 13 A. I'm not sure I understand the question. What --
- 14 what has clearly happened is that in -- in various
- 15 places public health authorities have given public
- 16 views in relation to lower-tar products. That's most
- 17 clearly what has happened in the United Kingdom where
- 18 working with that government British-American Tobacco
- 19 has looked at product modifications. It's very clear
- 20 that the Independent Committee on -- Scientific
- 21 Committee on Smoking and Health, who has worked with
- 22 the industry for some time, has taken views as to
- 23 what low-tar products may mean for people who choose
- 24 to smoke.
- I think those views have been given over

- 1 particularly to the U.K. population from the public
- 2 health authorities, and my guess is there is a -- a
- 3 public belief that a lower-tar product may be
- 4 better. British-American Tobacco does not make
- 5 health claims. British Tobacco -- American Tobacco
- 6 simply, I mean, couldn't provide that health
- 7 reassurance without the support of public health
- 8 authorities.
- 9 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 10 Sir, isn't it a fact that the B.A.T. Group did
- 11 attempt to reassure smokers by claiming low
- 12 deliveries of cigarettes?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. That precise
- 14 question was asked and answered.
- 15 A. And my answer again is that what has clearly
- 16 happened is that some governments have required, for
- 17 example, the -- the publication of -- of tar tables.
- 18 In the United Kingdom, British-American Tobacco has
- 19 worked with the government for some years. It has
- 20 been the view of the Independent Scientific Committee
- 21 on Smoking and Health that lower-tar products may
- 22 provide benefits to smokers. It is their view that
- 23 has prevailed in the public opinion.
- 24 British-American Tobacco does not make health
- 25 claims, and the fact that we under government

- 1 regulations put either tar or nicotine yields either,
- 2 depending on where you are, on packages or on
- 3 advertising doesn't mean to say that we're having any
- 4 view at all on that. What is the prevalent view is
- 5 that given by public health authorities.
- 6 Q. Well according to this document which was
- 7 approved by Mr. Sheehy, the next sentence says
- 8 "Furthermore, advertising for low delivery or
- 9 traditional brands should be constructed in ways so
- 10 as not to provoke anxiety about health, but to
- 11 alleviate it, and enable the smoker to feel assured
- 12 about the habit and confident in maintaining it over
- 13 time"; isn't that true, sir?
- 14 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. If -- if you're
- 15 asking him isn't it true that you read it correctly,
- 16 I have no objection. If you want him to interpret
- 17 the statement, then the witness has asked to read the
- 18 entire document and should be given that -- should be
- 19 given that opportunity.
- 20 A. And again, I mean, in terms of an answer, what
- 21 you read is -- is -- is what is in this document, and
- 22 I -- I mean, I can speak to what actions have
- 23 happened within British-American Tobacco, but in
- 24 terms of -- of interpreting that sentence in this
- 25 particular document, no, I really can't help.

- 1 Q. All right, sir. This document discusses the
- 2 organization and tactics as related to public
- 3 reassurance concerning the smoking and health at the
- 4 next page, doesn't it, sir?
- 5 A. I'll have to turn over.
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Again I object unless you're
- 7 asking him to read a specific sentence and asking
- 8 if -- if you're asking him to interpret it, then he
- 9 should be given the privilege of reading the
- 10 document.
- MS. WIVELL: Well, sir, you have given him
- 12 the privilege of reading the document and apparently
- 13 you didn't take it.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well is this one of the 500
- 15 you've designated?
- MS. WIVELL: This was one of the designated
- 17 documents, sir.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well we -- we had no
- 19 opportunity to let Dr. Proctor read 500 documents
- 20 comprising almost 6,000 pages in the brief time that
- 21 we've had since you designated this document.
- 22 MS. WIVELL: No, you took no opportunity to
- 23 show it to him.
- 24 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 25 Q. Sir, were you shown this document before the

- 1 deposition today?
- 2 A. I'm not familiar with this document.
- 3 Q. Okay. But just so we're clear here, there is a
- 4 heading entitled "Organisation & Tactics as Related
- 5 to Public Reassurance Concerning the Smoking Habit"
- 6 found at the page that ends with Bates number 795;
- 7 right?
- 8 A. It says on -- on that page item (4) or (4) in
- 9 parentheses, "Organisation & Tactics as Related to
- 10 Public Reassurance Concerning the Smoking Habit," and
- 11 then it says "A. ORGANISATION."
- 12 Q. And under that "ORGANISATION" it says "It became
- 13 increasingly obvious in conferences and discussions
- 14 from October until March that as smoking and health
- 15 is the major issue, companies must be properly
- 16 staffed to deal with ... all relevant functions";
- 17 right?
- 18 A. It says "to deal with it in all relevant
- 19 functions," but otherwise that's what it says in this
- 20 document.
- 21 Q. And as a matter of fact, the position which you
- 22 hold today is one of the things that is advocated as
- 23 one of those tactics for public health reassurance in
- 24 this document, isn't it, sir?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.

- 1 A. I mean, again I would have to read this
- 2 document. I can tell you and -- and help you in --
- 3 in respect to what British-American Tobacco's view is
- 4 in relation to where people get their information in
- 5 regards to smoking and health. I can't give you a
- 6 precise answer to that question unless you give me
- 7 the opportunity to read this document.
- 8 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that your job,
- 9 amongst others, is to defend the industry and to
- 10 provide public relations for the company?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection as a total
- 12 mischaracterization of the witness's testimony.
- 13 A. No, absolutely not. What I tried to describe
- 14 right at the beginning of these proceedings is what
- 15 my role is, and my role has several aspects, but
- 16 primarily it's to ensure that the company speaks with
- 17 accuracy in relation to the -- the science and
- 18 smoking and health. My other role is to ensure that
- 19 we are funding significant independent research in
- 20 relation to try and understand biological mechanisms
- 21 related to smoking and health.
- 22 Q. And you also respond to queries from the press;
- 23 right?
- 24 A. On occasions, if -- if there is an inquiry from
- 25 the media, I will give a response to that.

- 1 Q. And isn't it a fact that this document at the
- 2 next page talks about every one of the associated
- 3 companies having a person like yourself whose job
- 4 should be centered on consumer affairs, providing
- 5 strategies and the capability of acting quickly in
- 6 order to sustain consumer reassurance and defend the
- 7 industry position at governmental, regional and local
- 8 council levels?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the question.
- 10 Objection to the form of the question and objection
- 11 to taking a -- a section out of context of a document
- 12 without giving the witness an opportunity to read
- 13 it.
- 14 A. I mean, my response is that again you've read
- 15 one part of this document. What I can -- I can
- 16 respond in general terms, not as -- as it relates to
- 17 this document. In general terms and what has clearly
- 18 happened around the world is that the views of the
- 19 public health authorities have been dominant in terms
- 20 of people's opinion as to whether to choose to smoke
- 21 or not.
- 22 Q. I'm sorry, sir, did you understand that I asked
- 23 you about the public health authorities? Did you
- 24 hear those -- me ask you, use those words?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, argumentative.

- 1 The witness can respond to your question in a way
- 2 that's proper as -- as the question called.
- 3 A. I did not hear you say "public health authority"
- 4 in your question; however, in reality one has to
- 5 consider for any person exactly where they would get
- 6 information, and we're discussing here a -- a
- 7 document which hypothesized perhaps something in
- 8 terms of con -- con -- consumer reassurance. What
- 9 I'm telling you is it's my view that British-American
- 10 Tobacco has acted responsibly in this matter and it
- 11 is my view and British-American Tobacco's view that
- 12 the public's opinions in relation to smoking and
- 13 health are entirely dominated by what they have heard
- 14 from the public health authorities.
- 15 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 16 Sir, did you receive training in communications
- 17 and -- and how to give interviews?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. You haven't, none at all?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Okay. Were you trained in how to communicate
- 22 with the television personnel?
- 23 A. How to communicate with television personnel?
- 24 Q. Yes, speak in sound bites.
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Did you receive training on spin control?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 3 A. I'm not sure what spin control is. If -- if you
- 4 mean --
- 5 MR. SHEFFLER: It's an American term.
- 6 A. And I think I kind of understand in terms of --
- 7 of the term "spin doctors." If the question is have
- 8 I been trained in any way to try and provide
- 9 information to the media or to any other person in a
- 10 form which -- which tries to mislead, the answer is
- 11 absolutely not. I mean, what I am is -- is a
- 12 scientist, and what I have done through practice is
- 13 try and define ways to communicate complex scientific
- 14 matters in layperson's language. But have I been
- 15 educated to communicate? No, I have not.
- 16 Q. All right. Sir, could you turn to the last page
- 17 of Exhibit 591. There do you see the sentence that
- 18 begins "Finally, in order to communicate
- 19 well-attested and, " quote, "'proven,'" quote,
- 20 "benefits of smoking, the most promising vehicles
- 21 appear to be, " and then there's a list?
- 22 A. It says "Finally, in order to communicate
- 23 well-attested and 'proven' benefits of smoking, the
- 24 most promising vehicles appear to be: Reputable
- 25 research journals," et cetera, yeah.

- 1 Q. All right. Why don't you read the et cetera.
- 2 A. It says "Public relations releases to the media
- 3 and specific identified groups or opinion leaders;
- 4 Symposia/lectures; or, to the smoker direct, via:-
- 5 pack and outer inserts; leaflets."
- 6 Q. Sir, those are all methods that the B.A.T. Group
- 7 companies have used to communicate their stance on
- 8 public -- their stance on smoking-and-health issues;
- 9 isn't that true?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 11 A. I mean, let me consider that a bit because
- 12 there's a whole broad arena of communications here.
- 13 Have there been publications in reputable research
- 14 journals? Well yes. For example, I was published in
- 15 the -- the medical journal "The Lancet" quite
- 16 recently giving my view in relation to the tobacco
- 17 industry or more specifically British-American
- 18 Tobacco's funding of academic research, and that was
- 19 clearly published.
- 20 Public relations releases to the media, clearly
- 21 there are releases to the media on a variety of
- 22 issues. Very few of those, I would imagine, have
- 23 related to the issue of smoking and health. Most, by
- 24 far the majority, I would have thought of public
- 25 relations releases to the media would relate to -- to

- 1 business matters.
- 2 And it says "specific identified groups or
- 3 opinion leaders." I mean, I'm not quite sure what
- 4 that means. I mean, clearly on occasions people
- 5 within the company talk to people who may be
- 6 described as opinion leaders. And have we presented
- 7 at symposia and lectures? The answer is yes. I
- 8 mean, I have given quite a few presentations to
- 9 scientific symposia on the matter of environmental
- 10 tobacco smoke, for example.
- 11 Or to the smoker directly via pack and outer
- 12 inserts, if the -- the whole of this issue is related
- 13 to "proven," as it says this in quotes, benefits of
- 14 smoking and health, I am not aware of any pack or
- 15 outer insert which -- which has attempted to
- 16 communicate in relation to -- to what is here quoted
- 17 as proven benefits of smoking, nor am I aware of any
- 18 direct leaflets to smokers which -- which talk about
- 19 proven benefits of smoking coming from
- 20 British-American Tobacco.
- 21 And again back in the -- in the first three, if
- 22 the question's relating to the first part about
- 23 proven benefits, I mean, I don't think that any of my
- 24 work or the work of others in terms of presenting to
- 25 scientific fora have been discussing -- have been

- 1 focused upon proven benefits of smoking. What we've
- 2 been doing is making a -- a contribution as is right
- 3 to the scientific knowledge on a variety of issues
- 4 related to smoking and health.
- 5 Q. Now, sir, when these public relations releases
- 6 that are referred to here were made to the press, the
- 7 B.A.T. Group expected or in -- I'm sorry, intended
- 8 that the statements that were made in there would be
- 9 read; correct?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form.
- 11 A. I mean, it's a bit of a hypothetical. As I
- 12 said, I -- I don't -- I have no knowledge -- I have
- 13 no knowledge of any specific situation where a public
- 14 relations release -- and I assume that means a press
- 15 release of some kind -- has gone from
- 16 British-American Tobacco to, as it states before,
- 17 communicate proven benefits of smoking. So, I mean,
- 18 it's a bit of a hypothetical.
- 19 Q. Well, sir, from time to time members of B.A.T.
- 20 Group companies have been asked their opinion about
- 21 the relationship of smoking to the issues of whether
- 22 smoking causes diseases. You're aware of that,
- 23 aren't you?
- 24 A. I'm aware that from time to time people have
- 25 certainly been asked their opinion. That is

- 1 certainly quite a different situation from issuing a
- 2 press release, but yes, I'm sure people have -- have
- 3 made inquiries of us from a variety of different
- 4 places in relation to issues related to smoking and
- 5 health.
- 6 Q. And when the B.A.T. Group members responded to
- 7 those inquiries, it was intended that the people
- 8 would be able to rely on what the B.A.T. Group was
- 9 saying; right?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This has been
- 11 asked and answered repeatedly.
- MR. FRANKEL: And object to form.
- 13 A. And we covered this a little this morning. I'll
- 14 try and respond again. When British-American Tobacco
- 15 makes a statement in any forum, whether that be to
- 16 yourself, whether that be to a journalist or -- or
- 17 anywhere, I would hope that the information that is
- 18 given is as -- as accurate as it can be.
- 19 Q. And in fact, the people who then hear what any
- 20 of the B.A.T. Group company members have to say would
- 21 have a right to -- to rely on what they heard,
- 22 wouldn't they?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 24 overbroad, asked and answered.
- 25 A. And again, as we discussed this morning, what --

- 1 what happens in reality is that anyone that reads,
- 2 for example, something that might be a statement from
- 3 British-American Tobacco will take notice of that
- 4 information in terms of a broad range of information
- 5 they receive. And the predominant information on
- 6 issues relating to smoking and health, those
- 7 certainly come from the public health authorities.
- 8 Q. Well we looked earlier this morning at a
- 9 statement that Mr. Broughton made.
- 10 A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. Are you suggesting that the public should look
- 12 to the public health authorities to determine whether
- 13 or not British-American Tobacco -- I'm sorry, whether
- 14 B.A.T. Industries covered up evidence that it had in
- 15 its files?
- MR. SHEFFLER: We did look at that
- 17 statement and we have gone through this over and over
- 18 and over again. This is very repetitive. I object.
- 19 Move on, Counselor.
- 20 A. We did discuss this morning a -- a statement
- 21 made by Martin Broughton which appeared in the Wall
- 22 Street Journal. That statement I think, if you were
- 23 in the general public reading the Wall Street
- 24 Journal, would be one of many statements that you
- 25 would have read on that particular matter. I think

- 1 as a person, one, if they were interested in the
- 2 matter, would -- would take note of the various
- 3 opinions given.
- 4 Q. So if the FDA, for example, said that Brown &
- 5 Williamson had covered up information about the
- 6 addictive nature of smoking and health, that the
- 7 public should look to that statement instead of
- 8 Martin Broughton's; is that what you're saying?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. It --
- 10 mischaracterization of the testimony. It's -- it's a
- 11 hypothetical without foundation.
- MS. WIVELL: I object to your coaching.
- MR. SHEFFLER: It's not coaching,
- 14 Counselor.
- MS. WIVELL: All you have --
- MR. SHEFFLER: It's an objection.
- MS. WIVELL: -- to do is say "objection."
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: I said --
- 19 MS. WIVELL: That's fine.
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: -- "objection" and I said my
- 21 grounds and I stated them succinctly, and that's what
- 22 I have a right to do.
- 23 A. My answer is that someone in the general public
- 24 may read things that the -- the Food and Drug
- 25 Administration say and they may read things that

- 1 Martin Broughton says. It's up to them entirely as
- 2 to take their own views. I'm not saying that one way
- 3 or the other. They may wish to -- to use that as an
- 4 accumulation of knowledge and make their own
- 5 decisions if they're interested in that matter.
- 6 Q. So it would be reasonable for a person reading
- 7 Martin Broughton's denial of a cover-up of
- 8 information in the files of one of the B.A.T. Group
- 9 companies to believe that he was speaking the truth,
- 10 wouldn't it?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 12 question, objection to the repetitive nature of
- 13 this -- of these questions. It's argumentative.
- 14 A. My response is that I believe Martin Broughton
- 15 was speaking the truth. In terms of what is -- is
- 16 taken as an opinion by someone who may be reading the
- 17 Wall Street Journal on that day, that again is a
- 18 matter that they would decide for themselves on the
- 19 basis of a whole set of information they may be
- 20 listening to on that, and some of that may include
- 21 things that the Food and Drug Administration have
- 22 said.
- 23 Q. Sir, over the years the B.A.T. Group have taken
- 24 the position that there is a, quote, unquote,
- 25 "controversy" about whether smoking causes disease;

- 1 isn't that true?
- 2 A. I think you'll find in a variety of the
- 3 documents you've been -- been showing me that -- that
- 4 the statement or the word "controversy" is -- is put
- 5 in some of those documents. Now in -- in terms of
- 6 again looking at the public and where public take
- 7 their views on smoking and health and in terms of the
- 8 actions of British-American Tobacco to the public, I
- 9 believe the public view will be taken almost, well,
- 10 entirely from the public health authorities, and
- 11 whatever we have said within internal documents, I
- 12 don't think that is -- is reflected in terms of
- 13 people's understanding as to whether there's a
- 14 controversy or not.
- 15 I think the word "controversy" in -- in some
- 16 instances certainly tries to reflect the notion that
- 17 there is still much to be done in terms of
- 18 understanding biological mechanisms related to
- 19 smoking and health.
- 20 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 21 question is simple.
- Isn't it a fact that for decades the B.A.T.
- 23 Group companies have taken the position that there is
- 24 a, quote, unquote, "controversy" relating to whether
- 25 smoking causes disease?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to counsel's
- 2 statements. The -- the witness has answered that
- 3 precise question and answered it fully and
- 4 completely, and I object to the repetitive nature of
- 5 the question.
- 6 A. And again, I will respond that if you look at
- 7 the public environment and people taking views on
- 8 smoking and health, predominantly their views will be
- 9 taken from the public health authorities. The
- 10 term --
- 11 Q. Sir, I'm not asking you for --
- MR. SHEFFLER: You cannot interrupt the
- 13 witness's --
- MS. WIVELL: Well I --
- MR. SHEFFLER: -- answer.
- MS. WIVELL: -- I am going to interrupt
- 17 because he's not being responsive.
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: If you want to withdraw your
- 19 question, fine, but if you ask the witness a
- 20 question, he has the right to complete his answer,
- 21 Counselor. Your option is to either move to strike
- 22 the answer if you don't like it and think you can get
- 23 a better one or if you think it's not responsive, but
- 24 you do not have the right to interrupt his answer in
- 25 the midst of it.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: I'm going to move to strike as
- 2 nonresponsive.
- 3 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 4 Q. Sir, completely and apart from where you think
- 5 the public gets its information from, isn't it true
- 6 that for decades the B.A.T. Group companies have
- 7 claimed that there was a, quote, unquote,
- 8 "controversy" about whether smoking causes disease?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. I object to the
- 10 predicate for your -- of the question, and the
- 11 question itself has been asked and answered more than
- 12 once, even though you interrupted the last answer
- 13 when he was giving it again.
- 14 A. And again I'm -- I'm -- I'm trying to answer and
- 15 be as helpful as possible. I mean, I think if you're
- 16 saying "have claimed," there well may be documents
- 17 that -- that talk about a scientific controversy.
- 18 What my understanding of that is, that it tries to
- 19 reflect the fact that once public health authorities
- 20 have made their conclusions in relation to the
- 21 evidence they have, it is very clear research
- 22 continues and in order to try and understand the
- 23 biological mechanisms related to lung cancer and
- 24 other diseases.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please, to

- 1 change tape.
- 2 (Recess taken.)
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 592 was marked
- for identification.)
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 7 Exhibit 592, this is a document that begins with
- 8 Bates number 109881312; correct?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. And it's entitled "CHANGE OF STANCE ON SMOKING
- 11 AND HEALTH"; right?
- 12 A. That's what's at the top of the first page,
- 13 yeah.
- 14 Q. It's also at the top of the second page, isn't
- 15 it, sir?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And if you look at the top of the second page,
- 18 there's also a summary section at the top; right?
- 19 A. It says "SUMMARY," and I don't know how much of
- 20 the document that refers to.
- 21 Q. All right. It says right under the word
- 22 "SUMMARY" "The Board has been considering a change
- 23 in its stance on Smoking and Health because some of
- 24 our earlier views have been overtaken by events and
- 25 are now damaging to our interests"; correct?

- 1 A. That's what it says.
- 2 Q. And then it goes on to say "We believe a changed
- 3 stance will help us take initiatives to improve our
- 4 trading position"; right?
- 5 A. Again that's what it says.
- 6 Q. And then there is a suggested new stance in a
- 7 question-and-answer form; right?
- 8 A. It says "A Suggested New Stance, QUESTION," and
- 9 then "ANSWER," yeah.
- 10 Q. And the question is "Does B.A.T. think smoking
- 11 causes diseases such as cancer?" Right?
- 12 A. It says "Does B.A.T. think smoking causes
- 13 diseases such as cancer?" Yeah.
- 14 Q. And then the answer is -- or a suggested answer
- 15 is given; isn't that true?
- 16 A. There's an answer here on this piece of paper,
- 17 yeah.
- 18 Q. And that answer includes the claim that there is
- 19 a controversy which exists in the medical and
- 20 scientific community as to whether smoking causes
- 21 diseases; right?
- 22 A. Well if I read out the whole answer, it says "We
- 23 recognize that there is a growing body of responsible
- 24 medical/scientific opinion which believes that
- 25 smoking," then in parentheses, "(either on its own or

- 1 in combination with other environmental or genetic
- 2 factors), "end of brackets, "can cause or can
- 3 contribute to various diseases in a minority of
- 4 smokers. These views are shared by a number of
- 5 Governments of the countries in which we operate.
- 6 However, the medical/scientific view is by no means
- 7 unanimous on this issue and, therefore, a genuine
- 8 controversy continues. To help resolve this
- 9 question, B.A.T. has been carrying out an extensive
- 10 scientific research programme for many years.
- "As a responsible manufacturer we must respect
- 12 the views of the medical/scientific fraternity and
- 13 Governments, and respond to the consumer demand that
- 14 such views have created. We, therefore, consider it
- 15 our duty to provide the consumer with the widest
- 16 possible range of products so that in light of the
- 17 evidence that is freely and widely available, he can
- 18 choose how to regulate his smoking habit."
- 19 Q. All right. Sir, isn't it true that one of the
- 20 reasons that this suggested new stance was taken was
- 21 because the B.A.T. Group companies felt they must
- 22 defend themselves with regard to the attack they felt
- 23 they were under?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, calls for
- 25 speculation.

- 1 A. No. What I've -- I read out of that answer --
- 2 and this document is dated 1980, but it -- it follows
- 3 very much along the lines of the practice that
- 4 British-American Tobacco had in the U.K. from the
- 5 early '70s and in terms of its work with the U.K.
- 6 government and the Independent Scientific Committee
- 7 on Smoking and Health, looking at ways to make
- 8 product modifications in response to -- to their
- 9 views. And there's been a whole, I mean, history of
- 10 a product modification program working with the U.K.
- 11 government in which, as is reflected in this answer,
- 12 it is the public health authorities in the U.K. that
- 13 have -- have suggested that lower-tar products may be
- 14 better for those who choose to smoke.
- 15 And I think what this answer reflects is simply
- 16 what had been going on for some time in terms of
- 17 respect for those public health authorities and the
- 18 fact that British-American Tobacco as a company
- 19 should make a range of products that -- that respond
- 20 to the demands of smokers.
- 21 Q. Sir, could you turn to the second -- or the
- 22 third page of the document where it says "THE CURRENT
- 23 SITUATION."
- 24 A. I see that.
- 25 Q. It says "As we know all too well, the industry

- 1 has been under seige for a number of years and the
- 2 attack on the industry has strengthened rather than
- 3 declined"; right?
- 4 A. That's correct. That's point one.
- 5 Q. And then it goes on to say "A number of BAT
- 6 companies and the industry generally are taking
- 7 action to counter this attack and the results are
- 8 encouraging"; right?
- 9 A. That's point two.
- 10 Q. And as a matter of fact, right above this note
- 11 it says the purpose of it is to summarize the
- 12 position and to make a recommendation; correct?
- 13 A. It says above "THE CURRENT SITUATION" "The
- 14 purpose of this note is to summarise the position and
- 15 to make a recommendation." It has a point three in
- 16 "THE CURRENT SITUATION," which says "A major
- 17 difficulty for us is that public and medical opinion
- 18 has changed so much in the past twenty years that our
- 19 stance on smoking and health that we are not
- 20 doctors and cannot make judgments-is no longer
- 21 credible. In fact it is working against us and the
- 22 international reputation which is the basis of our
- 23 success, is being eroded."
- 24 Q. And it goes on to state a problem, doesn't it,
- 25 sir?

- 1 A. The next title in this document, which, I mean,
- 2 I guess is a public affairs document, says "THE
- 3 PROBLEM."
- 4 Q. And it says "How can we establish a new stance
- 5 which is not legally compromising and which can
- 6 provide a springboard for presenting our views
- 7 effectively and so ... to create a more favourable
- 8 business climate?"
- 9 A. That's what it says in this document.
- 10 Q. And, sir, what they're referring to here by a
- 11 stance that is not legally compromising is the fact
- 12 that there were smoking-and-health-related lawsuits
- 13 in the United States which needed to be taken into
- 14 account when coming to a new position; isn't that
- 15 true?
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, calls for
- 17 speculation.
- 18 A. I mean, that's certainly speculation in terms of
- 19 trying to put myself in the mind of the person who
- 20 wrote this document. I don't understand at all
- 21 from -- from the paragraph that you've just read to
- 22 me that that is -- is the case or that the author of
- 23 this document had in any -- any sense any
- 24 consideration of litigation that might have been
- 25 going on in the United States.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get
- 2 out -- get out Exhibit 503, please.
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 503 was handed
- 4 to the witness.)
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Sir, what's -- showing you what's been
- 7 previously marked as Exhibit 503, this is a document
- 8 entitled "LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS IN SMOKING AND HEALTH
- 9 ISSUES"; right?
- 10 A. Yeah, the title of this is "LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS
- 11 IN SMOKING AND HEALTH ISSUES."
- 12 Q. And it was sent by P. D. Moore, Assistant
- 13 Secretary; correct?
- 14 A. That's the -- the name at the bottom. It's not
- 15 signed, but that's the name that's written at the
- 16 bottom of this.
- 17 Q. And it says in the first paragraph "A note
- 18 issued by Mr. H. A. Morini, Legal Director of " -- "of
- 19 BATCo, was sent to you in May 1981"; right?
- 20 A. That's correct. That's what it says.
- 21 Q. All right. Why don't you read this document to
- 22 yourself.
- 23 A. Thanks.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Do you mind if I look over
- 25 his shoulder?

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Not at all.
- 2 A. Okay, I've read that.
- 3 Q. Now according to this document, the note which
- 4 was circulated initially in 1981 was being
- 5 recirculated with this memo; right?
- 6 A. It says here the note was issued and was sent to
- 7 you in May 1981. I don't know what was attached to
- 8 this letter. It's -- it's not here, but --
- 9 Q. Well we know it was entitled "LEGAL
- 10 CONSIDERATIONS IN SMOKING AND HEALTH ISSUES"; right?
- 11 A. Well no. We -- we know that -- that the title
- 12 of this letter from P. D. Moore, which isn't signed,
- 13 says "LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS IN SMOKING AND HEALTH
- 14 ISSUES." I'm not sure I would understand from the
- 15 document you've given me that any attached memo was
- 16 called that, but, I mean --
- 17 Q. All right. Well according to this note, what
- 18 was sent in 1981 was being recirculated with this
- 19 memo; right?
- 20 A. It says "A note issued ... was sent to you in
- 21 May 1981....
- 22 "Accordingly, the May 1981 note is being
- 23 re-circulated under cover of a note," so, I mean, I
- 24 assume a note is being recirculated. Whether that's
- 25 the same note, I don't know --

- 1 Q. All right.
- 2 A. -- or what that note refers to.
- 3 Q. Well it did stress the importance of
- 4 understanding the legal considerations involved in
- 5 smoking-and-health issues having particular regard to
- 6 the fate of the Manville Corporation in the USA;
- 7 right?
- 8 A. Again reading from -- from this letter without
- 9 its attachment, it says "The issues contained in that
- 10 note have now become of crucial importance to the
- 11 Group in view of recent developments in the USA of
- 12 which you may be aware, concerning the Manville
- 13 Corporation."
- 14 Q. All right. Do you understand what that
- 15 reference to the Manville Corporation is?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, calls for
- 17 speculation.
- 18 A. My answer is no, I do not know what the Manville
- 19 Corporation is or was.
- 20 Q. Did you understand that Man -- the
- 21 Johns-Manville Corporation sought bankruptcy
- 22 protection as a result of the numerous lawsuits
- 23 brought against it by people exposed to asbestos?
- 24 A. No, I -- I didn't understand that at all.
- 25 Q. All right. Sir, isn't it a fact that in order

- 1 to try and keep the controversy, the -- strike that.
- 2 Isn't it a fact that in order to try and keep
- 3 the claimed, quote, unquote, "controversy" about
- 4 cigarette smoking and disease alive, that people
- 5 within the B.A.T. Group worked with other members of
- 6 the tobacco industry?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Is that it?
- 8 MS. WIVELL: Yep.
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form of the
- 10 question, compound. Object to the assumptions in the
- 11 question.
- 12 A. I mean, your question says have British-American
- 13 Tobacco, as far as I understand it, worked with other
- 14 members of the tobacco industry to keep a controversy
- 15 alive. I think my response to that is again, if you
- 16 go to the real situation, people's views in relation
- 17 to smoking and health have absolutely been
- 18 predominantly taken from the views of the public
- 19 health authorities. It is the public health
- 20 authorities' views that a person takes into account
- 21 when they choose whether they wish to smoke or not.
- 22 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 23 Sir, I'm not talking about the public health
- 24 authorities now. I'm asking you isn't it a fact that
- 25 in order to try and keep the claimed, quote, unquote,

- 1 "controversy" alive, people within the various
- 2 B.A.T. Group companies worked with people from other
- 3 tobacco companies to keep the controversy alive?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 5 question, objection to the statements of counsel in
- 6 her predicate.
- 7 A. Your -- your -- your question really takes -- I
- 8 mean, there's two steps to your question. The one is
- 9 an assumption that British-American Tobacco has in
- 10 some state or form kept in the public mind the
- 11 scientific controversy alive. My -- my view of that
- 12 is that no, it has not; that people's views are taken
- 13 predominantly from the public health authorities.
- 14 The second part of your question is has
- 15 British-American Tobacco, so far as I understand it,
- 16 worked with other tobacco companies to that aim. In
- 17 that British-American Tobacco, in my view, has not
- 18 kept a scientific controversy alive in the view of
- 19 the public, then, I mean, the answer to the second
- 20 part is obviously no.
- 21 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that people within
- 22 British-American Tobacco Company worked with
- 23 representatives of R.J. Reynolds to create papers
- 24 that would help keep the controversy alive?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Excuse me.

- 1 Objection, mischaracterizes the witness's testimony,
- 2 and objection to the form of the question.
- 3 A. Not that I'm aware of. If -- if -- certainly in
- 4 my own personal opinion -- I believe this is true
- 5 through history -- personally I can never remember a
- 6 time where I sat down with anyone from the R.J.
- 7 Reynolds Company and wrote a joint document in
- 8 relation to my understanding of smoking and health.
- 9 I would not do that.
- 10 What I -- British-American Tobacco takes as its
- 11 views on smoking and health is our fundamental
- 12 understanding individually of -- of where the science
- 13 is. Again your question predicates that the notion
- 14 that we have kept a scientific controversy alive. I
- 15 think that simply is not real in terms of where the
- 16 public understand issues in relation to smoking and
- 17 health. I believe their understanding is entirely
- 18 predominated by the views of the public health
- 19 authorities.
- 20 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 21 Sir, isn't it a fact that people who were
- 22 employees of BATCO even before you became employees
- 23 of BATCO worked with representatives from the R.J.
- 24 Reynolds Company to help keep the smoking controversy
- 25 alive?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. It's asked and
- 2 answered.
- 3 A. And again the question assumes that the -- the
- 4 smoking-and-health controversy has been kept alive in
- 5 any shape or form or -- or there's been actions to
- 6 try and help keep that alive. I mean, my view is
- 7 again through history that is simply not reflected in
- 8 fact, that the fact is that I don't remember an
- 9 instance of -- of anything coming from either
- 10 British-American Tobacco or any of the other tobacco
- 11 companies that has significantly affected what the
- 12 public's views are and where they take those views in
- 13 terms of smoking and health. I'm convinced that
- 14 people take their views in relation to smoking and
- 15 health predominantly from the public health
- 16 authorities.
- 17 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that Mr. or Dr. F. G.
- 18 Colby of R.J. Reynolds authored a paper that was
- 19 submitted to B.A.T. Industries for review -- I'm
- 20 sorry, strike that.
- 21 Isn't it a fact that Dr. F. G. Colby of R.J.
- 22 Reynolds authored a paper that was reviewed by BATCO
- 23 that addressed the issue of the smoking-and-health
- 24 controversy?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, overbroad.

- 1 A. If that were to be the case, I'm not aware of
- 2 that instance.
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 593 was marked
- 4 for identification.)
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Sir, showing --
- 7 A. Thanks.
- 8 Q. -- you what's been marked as Plaintiffs'
- 9 Exhibit 593, this is a document from BATCO's files
- 10 Bates numbered 100440293; correct?
- 11 A. Yeah, it's 100440293.
- 12 Q. All right. And it's entitled "Comments on,"
- 13 quote, "'Smoking and Health,'" quote, "paper by
- 14 Dr. F.G. Colby"; right?
- 15 A. That's right, and then it gives a reference to
- 16 where that paper presumably was published, which is
- 17 the "Tobacco Journal International," I think. It's
- 18 "Tob. J. Int.," in 1983, and it gives reference to
- 19 the pages of that presumably publication, which is
- 20 page 4 -- 243 to 244.
- 21 Q. All right. Are you --
- 22 Is it your testimony that this paper was
- 23 published?
- 24 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. It -- the
- 25 document speaks for itself. The citation is

- 1 underneath the title, which he's just read into the
- 2 record.
- 3 A. Yeah, my -- my -- my assumption, since it gives
- 4 the specific reference to a publication, a date and
- 5 the page numbers in that publication, I would assume
- 6 that this is a -- a -- a paper that has been
- 7 published.
- 8 Q. Have you read it?
- 9 A. I certainly can't remember reading it, but then
- 10 I've read an awful lot of -- of scientific
- 11 publications. I can't remember specifically reading
- 12 this one.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, the first paragraph of this document
- 14 begins "The clearly expressed aim of" this "paper is
- 15 to establish that a controversy still exists about
- 16 the explanation for the statistical association
- 17 between smoking and various diseases, thereby
- 18 supporting the view prevailing in legal circles
- 19 advising the tobacco industry"; correct?
- 20 A. That's what it says as point one.
- 21 Q. All right. And did you understand or do you
- 22 understand today that it is the prevailing view in
- 23 legal circles advising the tobacco industry that it
- 24 must be claimed that there is a controversy which
- 25 exists?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 2 A. I mean, it's my understanding in -- in -- I
- 3 don't know what legal circles advise or not advise,
- 4 and it's my understanding that what is dealt with in
- 5 relation to smoking and health has to be accurate in
- 6 terms of what the science says. And I'm not sure --
- 7 I don't think I have ever heard or -- or been
- 8 suggested in any shape or form that there is a
- 9 requirement that there should be a controversy.
- 10 I mean, clearly what I would assume would
- 11 happen -- and I'm not very familiar with -- with the
- 12 litigation, but I assume what would happen is that
- 13 there would be a requirement to speak accurately and
- 14 forthrightly on what the scientific facts say.
- 15 Q. Well, sir, this first statement about a
- 16 controversy existing parallels the proposed answer
- 17 that's suggested in Exhibit 592 on the change of
- 18 stance on smoking and health, doesn't it?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form. I'd
- 20 also state for the record that this -- what is being
- 21 read here as the first statement in this exhibit is a
- 22 commentary purportedly on a published work, which has
- 23 not been tendered to the witness.
- 24 A. I mean, you're trying to ask -- you're asking me
- 25 to compare two documents, neither of which I've read

- 1 in full. I can give you, to try and be helpful, a
- 2 view in terms of your questions in -- in relation to
- 3 controversy, and my view is that the -- the facts are
- 4 that in the public mind people have taken their
- 5 information from the public health authorities. And
- 6 there clearly is a continued effort within the
- 7 academic communities, to which we contribute, to try
- 8 and understand biological mechanisms related to
- 9 disease.
- 10 But, I mean, to try and help you further, I
- 11 really need to take time reading these two if you
- 12 wish me to make a comparison of them.
- 13 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 14 Sir, the suggested new stance on the
- 15 smoking-and-health issue that's listed in 592
- 16 suggests that there should be a claim of a
- 17 controversy; correct?
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, misstatement.
- 19 A. I mean, if I read again to try and answer your
- 20 question what -- what the suggested new stance is
- 21 here, it says "We recognize that there is a growing
- 22 body of responsible medical/scientific opinion which
- 23 believes that smoking (either on its own or in
- 24 combination with other environmental or genetic
- 25 factors) can cause or can contribute to various

- 1 diseases in a minority of smokers. These views are
- 2 shared by a number of Governments of the countries in
- 3 which we operate. However, the medical/scientific
- 4 view is by no means unanimous on this issue and,
- 5 therefore, a genuine controversy continues. To help
- 6 resolve this question, B.A.T. has been carrying out
- 7 an extensive scientific research programme for many
- 8 years.
- 9 "As a responsible manufacturer we must respect
- 10 the views of the medical/scientific fraternity and
- 11 Governments, and respond to the consumer demand that
- 12 such views have created. We, therefore, consider it
- 13 our duty to provide the consumer with the widest
- 14 possible range of products so that in the light of
- 15 the evidence that is freely and widely available, he
- 16 can choose how to regulate his smoking habit."
- 17 And I think my impression of what this -- this
- 18 document says in that answer in terms of your
- 19 questions in relation to controversy are really
- 20 reflected, as I said before, in the fact there
- 21 continues to be a scientific effort to understand the
- 22 biological mechanisms, but British-American Tobacco
- 23 respects what public health authorities have given as
- 24 their view to -- to the public and we also, as is
- 25 very clearly stated in this -- what is it? -- 1980

- 1 document, it was clearly the case before 1980 and it
- 2 was clearly the view in 1980 that we should work in a
- 3 responsible fashion with -- with governments and
- 4 the -- the medical and scientific fraternity.
- 5 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that at the time that this
- 6 claim of a genuine medical controversy existing was
- 7 written in Exhibit 592 there was little or no
- 8 evidence that such a controversy existed?
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, asked and
- 10 answered.
- 11 A. And again, in response to your question, I don't
- 12 think it's -- it is fairly representing what the
- 13 views were by taking one line out of what is a fairly
- 14 long answer on a -- on a -- what is suggested in this
- 15 document as a -- a new stance. I think the thrust of
- 16 this stance, which is actually borne out in terms of
- 17 the behavior in particular in the United Kingdom, is
- 18 the fact that British-American Tobacco would be
- 19 respectful of -- of public health authorities and
- 20 would work with governments in relation to issues on
- 21 smoking and health.
- 22 And it goes on to say that we would provide a
- 23 wide range of products in light really of what the
- 24 public health authorities were saying, and in the
- 25 United Kingdom, I mean, that is clearly -- to try and

- 1 put context to this document, this sits right in the
- 2 middle of the product modification program and that
- 3 is -- is clearly well documented in -- in a variety
- 4 of -- of areas, particularly through the writings of
- 5 Sir Peter Froggatt, where the industry in the United
- 6 Kingdom, including British-American Tobacco, worked
- 7 with the government in a whole series of programs to
- 8 try and identify product modifications by which the
- 9 public health authorities could regard the products
- 10 as being safer for the general community.
- 11 That's a program that -- that went on for many
- 12 years, and certainly I think consumers' behavior has
- 13 changed in light of what the Independent Scientific
- 14 Committee on Smoking and Health and the various
- 15 subsequent consequences of that program have --
- 16 have -- have given to the public.
- 17 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 18 Sir, did you understand that I was going to take
- 19 the deposition of the public health authorities in
- 20 the U.K. today?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- MR. FRANKEL: Objection.
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: That's argumentative. It
- 24 doesn't deserve a response. Ask a question.
- 25 A. No. My understanding is -- is that you have --

- 1 I -- I am here to provide you with as much help as I
- 2 can in terms of my understanding of -- of the
- 3 companies British-American Tobacco and B.A.T.
- 4 Industries, both views and actions in relation to
- 5 smoking and health, and I think it would be
- 6 impossible to try and express those views accurately
- 7 without giving reference to the whole environmental
- 8 context of that debate.
- 9 And as we've been discussing specific line items
- 10 in some of the documents you've been showing me in
- 11 relation to controversy, the fact is in -- in --
- 12 in -- in real life in the public arena are people
- 13 taking their views from what they've heard
- 14 generally. And whether or not some of these
- 15 documents suggest controversy or not and what is
- 16 meant by some of these documents, the fact is that
- 17 people have taken their views from the public health
- 18 authorities, and it's -- it's very hard for me to
- 19 answer your questions in -- in a proper manner
- 20 without making reference to the total situation.
- 21 Q. Well, sir, let's try and get back to the
- 22 question that I asked originally.
- 23 Isn't it true that at the time that this claim
- 24 was made that there was a, quote, "genuine
- 25 controversy" which continued, that as a matter of

- 1 fact there was little or no evidence for such a
- 2 controversy and BATCO knew it?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the predicate
- 4 statements of counsel. Objection to the form of the
- 5 question. Objection, asked and answered.
- 6 A. And again I will respond that it is my reading
- 7 of this that it is clear certainly in 1980 and it
- 8 continues in 1997 that there was still a tremendous
- 9 amount of effort going on within the academic
- 10 community to identify biological mechanisms which may
- 11 be related to diseases such as lung cancer. And I
- 12 suspect that is what that controversy refers to.
- 13 I don't know whether "controversy" is -- is the
- 14 best word to describe that, but it's a clear fact
- 15 there is research efforts going on in -- in -- in the
- 16 academic environment.
- 17 Q. Could you please turn to the last page of
- 18 Exhibit 593.
- 19 A. Sorry, 593. Yeah.
- 20 Q. And there it says, quote, "To persist in
- 21 stressing controversy, where little or no evidence
- 22 for such controversy is seen to exist, can only
- 23 result in a complete loss of credibility"; isn't that
- 24 true, sir?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the

- 1 question. As -- as this document, 593, is a -- is
- 2 a -- is a wholly different document than what we were
- 3 talking about before, there's no definition provided
- 4 in this portion of what the controversy that was
- 5 being referred to since the paper that this is
- 6 commenting on has not been provided.
- 7 A. And again in trying to respond accurately to
- 8 your -- your question, I mean, what -- what I have --
- 9 and I still haven't had an opportunity to read this
- 10 in full -- is a -- a document which says "D.G.
- 11 Felton, " August 2 or "2 August 1983" at the bottom,
- 12 which seems to be a commentary on a -- a published
- 13 paper. And, I mean, I really can't get into the mind
- 14 of a particular individual commenting on a -- on a
- 15 published paper.
- 16 What I can tell you is that what -- my belief
- 17 of -- of the view of what British-American Tobacco
- 18 has done --
- 19 Q. Why don't you answer my question, sir.
- MR. SHEFFLER: No, no, you cannot do that.
- 21 Q. My question is --
- MR. SHEFFLER: I'm sorry, Coun --
- 23 Q. -- and I quote -- and I'll read it back so you
- 24 have it in mind.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Counselor, you must let the

- 1 witness finish his answer. This is not proper
- 2 deposition technique. You must let the witness
- 3 finish his answer. You cannot interrupt him in the
- 4 midst of it, and it was a responsive answer.
- 5 Q. Sir, my question is: And there it says, quote,
- 6 "To persist in stressing controversy, where little
- 7 or no evidence for such controversy is seen to exist,
- 8 can only result in ... complete loss of credibility,"
- 9 close quote; isn't that true, sir?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Can you have the first
- 11 portion of the answer read back until he was --
- MS. WIVELL: Well it's nonresponsive and
- 13 I'm going to move to strike as nonresponsive.
- MR. SHEFFLER: You can --
- MS. WIVELL: Let's see if we can get this
- 16 done easily.
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Counselor, I would suggest
- 18 if you want to get this done, then you show proper
- 19 form and let the witness complete his answer. Now
- 20 the witness has started his answer. He's entitled to
- 21 complete that answer, and I would like to have the --
- 22 the answer that was begun and interrupted by counsel
- 23 read back to me, please.
- MS. WIVELL: Well I'm going to move to
- 25 strike it as nonresponsive.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: You can do that.
- 2 MS. WIVELL: Let's try it again.
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: You can do that, but I'm
- 4 still going to have the answer read back as it was
- 5 and let the witness finish it. Then you can move to
- 6 strike it.
- 7 (Record read by the court reporter.)
- 8 MS. WIVELL: Clearly nonresponsive. Let
- 9 me --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well how can you --
- 11 MS. WIVELL: -- withdraw the question and I
- 12 will start again.
- MR. SHEFFLER: If you withdraw the
- 14 question, that's fine, but, Counselor, you cannot
- 15 interrupt the -- the answer and say it's
- 16 nonresponsive until you hear the complete answer.
- MS. WIVELL: Well it hasn't been responsive
- 18 so far.
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir --
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well he was -- he wasn't
- 22 given an opportunity to finish his answer.
- 23 Q. Sir, my question is simply this: Does it say
- 24 there, quote, "To persist in stressing controversy,
- 25 where little or no evidence for such controversy is

- 1 seen to exist, can only result in a complete loss of
- 2 credibility," close quote?
- 3 MR. FRANKEL: Whether or not that's what
- 4 the document says is a completely different question
- 5 than what you previously asked.
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: She's asking --
- 7 MS. WIVELL: Nonsense.
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Well, no, she -- she
- 9 withdrew her previous question. She's asking him if
- 10 it says that. Does it -- does it -- are those words
- 11 on that page is the question.
- MS. WIVELL: That was my question before
- 13 too.
- MR. SHEFFLER: No, it wasn't.
- MR. FRANKEL: I believe your last question
- 16 was is that true.
- 17 A. The answer's yes.
- 18 Q. Thank you.
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: For this question.
- 20 Q. Now, sir, wasn't it --
- 21 Isn't it a fact that there was a -- an agreement
- 22 within the tobacco industry that in order to reassure
- 23 smokers, that all tobacco companies would claim there
- 24 was a, quote, "controversy" when there really wasn't
- 25 one?

- 1 A. To my knowledge, there's been no agreement
- 2 within tobacco companies in relation to -- to claim a
- 3 controversy.
- 4 Q. Isn't it a fact that there was a conspiracy
- 5 among the tobacco companies to keep the claimed,
- 6 quote, unquote, "controversy" alive when they knew it
- 7 didn't exist?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Again this is all repetitive
- 9 and note my objection.
- 10 A. And my answer to that is I have no knowledge of
- 11 a conspiracy to -- to try and -- I'm not sure quite
- 12 what -- actually could you repeat the question just
- 13 so I can just make my -- my statement accurately.
- 14 Q. Certainly. Isn't it a fact that there was
- 15 contro -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 16 Isn't it a fact that there was a conspiracy
- 17 among the tobacco companies to keep the claimed,
- 18 quote, unquote, "conspiracy" alive when they knew it
- 19 didn't even exist?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Same objections.
- 21 A. If you meant in the question controversy alive
- 22 as opposed to conspiracy alive, my answer to that is
- 23 no.
- 24 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that B.A.T.
- 25 Industries representatives met with representatives

- 1 of Brown & Williamson to make sure that they were all
- 2 stressing the controversy concerning smoking and
- 3 health?
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The question is
- 5 vague and overbroad.
- 6 A. I don't know whether members of B.A.T.
- 7 Industries at some stage had meetings with people
- 8 from Brown & Williamson to stress the controversy.
- 9 What I can tell you again is exactly what has
- 10 happened as a matter of fact; that if you look at
- 11 the -- the public environment, there is, I don't
- 12 think, any notion within the public of a
- 13 controversy.
- 14 MR. SHEFFLER: Marti, if you could just
- 15 throw them over a little bit more so that we can
- 16 reach them, it would be helpful.
- 17 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 594 was marked
- for identification.)
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 21 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 594, this is a document Bates
- 22 numbered 109837925; correct?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Excuse me, I need to check
- 25 with local counsel before we can use this document.

- 1 Off the record for just -- just one second. We can
- 2 stay on the record, but I just have to ask a
- 3 question.
- 4 MS. WIVELL: We can go off the record.
- 5 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 6 (Discussion off the record.)
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Let me just state for the
- 8 record I -- I believe that this document may contain
- 9 a communication that would be a privileged
- 10 communication; however, I -- we don't have enough
- 11 information at this point in time to -- to make that
- 12 final ascertainment, and I will allow questions to be
- 13 asked without the subject of any waiver of -- of our
- 14 position with respect to whether or not it is in fact
- 15 privileged.
- MS. WIVELL: Well if it's privileged, it
- 17 would be on your privilege log, and I don't believe
- 18 this document is on your privilege log. Is this
- 19 document on your privilege log, sir?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: That's what I was trying to
- 21 ascertain, Counselor, and I have not been able to
- 22 ascertain that in this brief time.
- MS. WIVELL: Well this document was
- 24 previously disclosed to you in our designation, and I
- 25 have not received any notification that it was on

- 1 your privilege log. It is not on your privilege log
- 2 to -- based on my review of the files, and --
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Listen.
- 4 MS. WIVELL: -- all documents to which you
- 5 claim privilege had to be provided to us no later
- 6 than, I believe, the 1st of May of this year and all
- 7 documents that were not on the privilege log were
- 8 deemed waived as of that point. So I'm going forward
- 9 with my examination --
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: I haven't --
- MS. WIVELL: -- with regard to this
- 12 document.
- MR. SHEFFLER: I haven't tried to stop
- 14 you. What I'm simply saying is I preserve all rights
- 15 with respect to any objections we may have for the
- 16 use of this document.
- 17 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 18 Q. Sir, Exhibit 594 concerns a meeting that
- 19 Dr. Blackman had -- or concerns a visit to Brown &
- 20 Williamson in Louisville made by Dr. Blackman in
- 21 1984; correct?
- 22 A. I'm not certain. It's titled "VISIT TO BROWN &
- 23 WILLIAMSON, LOUISVILLE," and the author seems to be a
- 24 Sue Maylin and then --
- 25 Q. All right.

- 1 A. -- with the letter copied to Mr. Pritchard and
- 2 Mr. Blackman, so I'm not certain whether this is
- 3 Mr. Blackman's visit or not.
- 4 Q. Well just so the ladies and gentlemen of the
- 5 jury understand, Lionel Blackman was head of research
- 6 and development for BATCO at the time that this visit
- 7 took place; right?
- 8 A. The date is February 6, 1994. I believe --
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: '84.
- 10 A. Sorry, '84. I believe that Dr. Blackman was --
- 11 was certainly at research in Southampton. I think he
- 12 headed that group.
- 13 Q. All right. And it shows the people -- that he
- 14 is present among the people listed on the first page
- 15 of Exhibit 594; right?
- 16 A. This visit note says "Present," a variety of
- 17 people, including Dr. Blackman, yes.
- 18 Q. And Dr. Hughes, Mr. Sandefur, Mr. Kohnhorst,
- 19 Dr. Sanford and Mr. Pritchard were all at the time
- 20 Brown & Williamson employees; correct?
- 21 A. I believe so. I mean, I couldn't be with
- 22 absolute certainty, but that would be my belief.
- 23 Q. Would you turn to the last page of the document,
- 24 please, sir. Do you see the reference to "SMOKING
- 25 AND HEALTH" and to a separate meeting with Mr. Pep --

- 1 Pepples and Mr. -- and Dr. Blackman?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: I think it's Pepples.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: I think it is, too, and I
- 4 always get it wrong. Let me rephrase the question.
- 5 Q. Do you see there a separate -- a reference to a
- 6 separate meeting with Mr. Pepples and Dr. Blackman?
- 7 A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. All right. And it says there "The current legal
- 9 cases in New Jersey were explained. Although they
- 10 called for extreme care in what was said or implied
- 11 in our writings and talking we must continue to
- 12 stress the controversy, and cite anomalies";
- 13 correct?
- 14 A. I mean, that's what it says on this paper. I'm
- 15 not sure what the -- the "they" refers to, but that's
- 16 what's stated here.
- 17 Q. And then in that sentence, the "we must" is
- 18 underlined; right?
- 19 A. It's underlined on this document. I'm not sure
- 20 whether it's type underlined or something that was
- 21 written in.
- 22 Q. All right. But the words "we must" are
- 23 underlined; correct?
- 24 A. Yes, on this copy of the document.
- 25 Q. And it goes on to say "To remain silent would

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 not be in the interests of the industry"; right?
- 2 A. That's what it says here.
- 3 Q. Did you ever talk to Dr. Blackman about that
- 4 meeting?
- 5 A. No, I have not.
- 6 Q. So you don't know of anything that occurred at
- 7 that meeting that is contrary to what's written
- 8 here, --
- 9 MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 10 Q. -- do you, sir?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Object.
- 12 A. I mean, I -- I don't know of that meeting or any
- 13 of the details related to that meeting. I mean, I
- 14 can give a view on -- on again the subject we've been
- 15 discussing for a while in relation to controversy and
- 16 exactly what has happened in terms of -- of the
- 17 real -- of real life. But was I at that meeting?
- 18 No, I was not, and -- and I can't really give a view
- 19 as to what happened at that meeting or in the
- 20 statement you've read to me who the "they" refers
- 21 to.
- 22 Q. Well do you understand that "the current legal
- 23 cases in New Jersey" refers to the Dewey and the
- 24 Cipollone cases which were filed in New Jersey?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Object.

- 1 A. I mean, I -- I don't have detailed knowledge
- 2 of -- of litigations that happen in the United
- 3 States. I've heard of the Cipollone case. I haven't
- 4 heard of the other case you just stated, and I
- 5 actually don't know whether in February 6th, 1984
- 6 whether those cases were undergoing or not.
- 7 Q. Now, sir, at the time that this meeting took
- 8 place, there was a great deal of statistical evidence
- 9 already linking smoking and disease; isn't that
- 10 true?
- 11 A. This meeting was in 1984, and I think, yeah,
- 12 there had certainly been epidemiological studies for
- 13 many years previous to that indicating that a
- 14 relationship between smoking and various diseases.
- 15 Q. Now at the time this meeting took place, it --
- 16 it was known by the B.A.T. Group that it was not
- 17 simply the volume of information on smoking and
- 18 health that led medical authorities to believe that
- 19 smoking caused a number of diseases, but it was also
- 20 the nature and quantity of the evidence; isn't that
- 21 true?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 23 question, vague, overbroad.
- 24 A. In terms of any understanding I get out of this
- 25 document, I mean, I'm not sure I can make a

- 1 conclusion. I think clearly if you, as I have in
- 2 front of me here, read the various reports by the
- 3 U.S. Surgeon General or by -- the reports by the
- 4 Independent Scientific Committee on Smoking and
- 5 Health, that there is a variety of data that people
- 6 have taken and for them to reach their view. I think
- 7 primarily that is statistical associations, but
- 8 clearly people have looked at other types of
- 9 scientific data also.
- 10 Q. Well, sir, and isn't it a fact that at the time
- 11 that this meeting took place, it was known to the
- 12 B.A.T. Group members that there was no controversy?
- 13 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. This has been
- 14 asked and answered repeatedly.
- 15 A. I mean, my answer is, I mean, it depends again
- 16 what the term is -- "controversy" is referred to
- 17 here. As I said, I wasn't at that meeting. The fact
- 18 is again, as -- as I've referred to in the past, that
- 19 in practical terms, in real life and where people
- 20 have taken their views on the smoking and health have
- 21 been predominantly from the public health
- 22 authorities. And whatever these reference are to
- 23 controversy, the fact is, in my understanding,
- 24 British-American Tobacco Company has not made
- 25 statements to the public that has taken away what I

- 1 think the public's views -- the public's predominant
- 2 source of views are, which -- which is the public
- 3 health authorities.
- 4 Q. What's the Blue Book, sir?
- 5 A. I'm not sure that there is the Blue Book. Is
- 6 there a reference to it in here?
- 7 Q. I'm just asking if you know what the Blue Book
- 8 is.
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 10 overbroad. Any -- there's -- there's a -- Harvard
- 11 Citations is a blue book.
- 12 A. I mean, I've heard of -- of a Blue Book.
- 13 Q. Do you understand --
- 14 A. I presume it's not this blue book here by
- 15 Nicholas Wald and Peter Froggatt. I mean, to try and
- 16 answer your question I think in -- in a helpful
- 17 manner, I've heard of something called the Blue Book,
- 18 which I gather is a -- a compendium of -- of data
- 19 from -- from external research looking at a broad
- 20 range of data in relation to smoking and health.
- 21 Q. The Blue Book was put together by the R&D
- 22 department of BATCO to discuss the issues of smoking
- 23 and health; isn't that true?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 25 A. I mean, I -- my belief is that there was a

- 1 compendium of epidemiological studies put together as
- 2 one part of the considerations of British-American
- 3 Tobacco in relation to smoking and health. It was by
- 4 no means the only part of those considerations.
- 5 Q. And the Blue Book was entitled "Smoking and
- 6 Health, wasn't it, sir?
- 7 A. I'm not sure whether it was entitled "Smoking
- 8 and Health" or not. I've heard it referred to as a
- 9 compendium of epidemiological studies.
- 10 Q. Well you understood that in the early '80s the
- 11 R&D department at BATCO put together the Blue Book;
- 12 isn't that true?
- 13 A. I mean, my understanding is that -- that some
- 14 people at R&D rather than the whole R&D department
- 15 gathered together information from the public domain
- 16 and put it together as a compendium.
- 17 Q. And those people included Ray Thornton and
- 18 Dr. Blackman; isn't that true?
- 19 A. That is my belief, certainly that Dr. Thornton
- 20 was involved in that, and I'm not sure to what extent
- 21 Dr. Blackman was. I believe that Dr. Thornton was --
- 22 would have been the person who put together most of
- 23 that information.
- 24 Q. And when this book on smoking and health was put
- 25 together, it was sent to BATCO consultants for their

- 1 comments; isn't that true?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 3 Which book are we talking about? He's named one book
- 4 and you've named a different one.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: No, I don't think that's
- 6 true.
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Well he's talked about -- he
- 8 said that the book was entitled "The -- The
- 9 Compendium of Epidemiological Studies, " I believe,
- 10 and you're talking about a book entitled -- now
- 11 entitled "Smoking and Health." Are they -- I don't
- 12 know if they're the same or not, but that's my
- 13 objection because the record is unclear. If you want
- 14 the record to be unclear, go ahead, Doctor.
- 15 A. Could you -- sorry. Could you repeat the
- 16 question again.
- 17 Q. Now, and when this book on smoking and health
- 18 was put together, it was sent to BATCO consultants
- 19 for their comments; isn't that true?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 21 A. I don't have enough detailed knowledge in terms
- 22 of where the compendium, as I understand it, was sent
- 23 and who it might have been sent to.
- 24 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 595 was marked
- for identification.)

- 1 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 2 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 3 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 4 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 595, this document begins with
- 5 the Bates number 100432193; correct?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. And it is --
- 8 The first page is a letter from
- 9 Francis J. C. Roe to Dr. Ray Thornton; right?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. And at the time -- pardon me.
- 12 At the time Dr. Thornton was with Group Research
- 13 and Development Centre, British-American Tobacco
- 14 Company Limited; right?
- 15 A. That's the address noted there, yeah.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Counsel, we've -- we've had
- 17 a chance to go through the lengthy predesignation of
- 18 documents, and this document does not appear to be on
- 19 the list, either list, either the designated list or
- 20 the supplemental designated list. And therefore, we
- 21 object to the use of the document with this witness.
- 22 MS. WIVELL: Actually I believe it was
- 23 previously marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 422, and I
- 24 didn't realize it until I had it re-marked. I'm
- 25 sorry. So it would be on the predesignation list.

- 1 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 2 Q. Sir, the first page of this document is a letter
- 3 from Francis Roe to Dr. Thornton; right?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. And Mr. Roe -- or I'm sorry, doctor -- it's
- 6 Dr. Roe, isn't it?
- 7 A. I'm not sure whether it's doctor or mister. I'm
- 8 sorry, it says right at the top here "Dr. Francis J.
- 9 C. Roe" and it gives his qualifications, yeah.
- 10 Q. All right. Well you understand that he was a
- 11 B.A.T. -- BATCO consultant; right?
- 12 A. It's my understanding that Francis Roe is -- is
- 13 a scientist that has consulted on occasion with
- 14 British-American Tobacco.
- 15 Q. All right. And he had been submitted the
- 16 revised book on smoking and health according to the
- 17 cover letter; right?
- 18 A. It says that he's giving comments on a revised
- 19 book on smoking and health, yes.
- 20 Q. And he says "It falls a long way short of
- 21 credibility and ... would be disastrous to release it
- 22 as BAT's considered view in this country"; right?
- 23 A. He says that.
- 24 Q. All right. He also goes on to say that "It is
- 25 not really true, as the American Tobacco Industry

- 1 would like to believe, that there is a raging
- 2 worldwide controversy about the causal link between
- 3 smoking and certain diseases"; isn't that true, sir?
- 4 A. I'm sorry, where's that? It's certainly not on
- 5 the first page.
- 6 Q. No, it's the top of the second page, isn't it,
- 7 sir?
- 8 A. I don't know. I need to turn over.
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Counsel, do you
- 10 have the book that this is -- this commentary is
- 11 referring to? I object because the -- the predicate
- 12 questions for this document was with respect to a
- 13 Blue Book or an --
- MS. WIVELL: I object to your comments on
- 15 this on the record.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Well I think I have the
- 17 right to do this.
- MS. WIVELL: I don't think you do, sir. I
- 19 think you're coaching the witness.
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Well I'm going -- I'm not
- 21 coaching the witness. I'm going to make my objection
- 22 for the record.
- I believe this is misappropriate use of the
- 24 document. I think it's ambiguous and I think it
- 25 is -- is wrong to use the document in the format that

- 1 you have. The document does not identify what it was
- 2 referring to. The questions leading up to this --
- 3 this document had to do with some Blue Book. There's
- 4 nothing in this document talking about a Blue Book
- 5 and there's been no foundation laid for it, and I
- 6 object on that basis.
- 7 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 8 Q. Do you have my question in mind, sir?
- 9 A. Oh, no, sorry. Could you repeat it?
- 10 Q. Certainly. And he goes on to say "It is not
- 11 really true, as the American Tobacco Industry would
- 12 like to believe, that there is a raging worldwide
- 13 controversy about the causal link between smoking and
- 14 certain diseases"; isn't that true, sir?
- 15 A. I'm not sure he goes on to say, but certainly
- 16 that is under "Comments on Substance," that the first
- 17 statement he gives in reference to page one, para
- 18 six, of -- of this document that I haven't seen on
- 19 issues on -- of smoking and the -- exactly what you
- 20 just read out from this document.
- 21 Q. All right. Sir, if we turn to the last page of
- 22 the document, there is a letter there to Kendrick
- 23 Wells, Corporate Counsel at Brown & Williamson
- 24 Tobacco Corporation; isn't that true?
- 25 A. There is some letter which is not signed. I

- 1 don't know whether it's a -- a proper letter or a
- 2 draft letter, but certainly at the bottom of it it
- 3 says "L C F BLACKMAN." At the top of it it says
- 4 "Mr" K -- sorry, "J Kendrick Wells III."
- 5 Q. All right. And you understand that J. Kendrick
- 6 Wells, III, is a lawyer for Brown & Williamson
- 7 Tobacco; right?
- 8 A. Well on this letter it states his position as
- 9 being corporate counsel, B&W Tobacco Corporation.
- 10 Q. All right. And you know that he's a lawyer for
- 11 Brown & Williamson; right?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. All right. And it says in the first sentence of
- 14 that I at last -- or "At last I enclose an up-date on
- 15 Son of Blue Book"; right?
- 16 A. That's what it says here.
- 17 Q. All right. And do you understand that what's
- 18 being referred to here is the document that was
- 19 submitted to Dr. Roe?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, lack of
- 21 foundation.
- 22 A. I mean, my answer is I have -- I have no idea.
- 23 I don't know whether this -- this letter attached to
- 24 the back of this document was originally appended to
- 25 these comments from -- from Dr. Roe, whether -- it

- 1 doesn't seem to me that that's likely to be the case
- 2 since it says "I enclose an up-date of the Son of
- 3 Blue Book" and I don't see any appendage here
- 4 which -- which would suggest that we have in this
- 5 document whatever the Son of Blue Book is.
- 6 Q. All right. Well at the bottom it says "PS:
- 7 With Geoff Felton and Ray Thornton I am progressing
- 8 the alternative version of the publication, as
- 9 proposed and outlined by Francis Roe"; correct?
- 10 A. That's what it says.
- 11 Q. All right. And if you look at the page that
- 12 ends with Bates number 200 in Exhibit 595, it's
- 13 entitled "The Issue of Smoking"; right?
- 14 A. 200 says, yeah, "The Issue of Smoking."
- 15 Q. And this is a memo from Ray Thornton to
- 16 Dr. Blackman enclosing the comments of Dr. Roe on the
- 17 book; isn't that true?
- 18 A. It says at the top of this "I have received the
- 19 enclosed comments from Dr. F.J.C. Roe on this book."
- 20 MR. FRANKEL: I would object --
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Let the record reflect that
- 22 the letter that is dated October 1982 to Wells is
- 23 about six months after the memo to Thornton.
- MS. WIVELL: I object to your coaching the
- 25 witness.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: It's not coaching. You're
- 2 trying to mislead the witness and trying to use these
- 3 exhibits inappropriately. There's a number of pages
- 4 stapled together here. There's no indication that
- 5 any of these are related to anything else. I don't
- 6 know how this document was used in a prior
- 7 deposition. It certainly wasn't designated to us for
- 8 this deposition except by -- by reference to other --
- 9 other depositions, and I'm not sure how this was used
- 10 in those depositions.
- 11 MR. FRANKEL: I would -- I would also
- 12 object to the continued use by counsel of the phrase
- 13 "isn't that true" as being ambiguous because it's
- 14 unclear whether the question means whether the
- 15 substance of the statement as read is true or whether
- 16 the statement was correct -- correctly read into the
- 17 record.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Now, sir, isn't it a fact that BATCO's own head
- 20 of R&D believed that the pub -- that the company
- 21 should change its position on smoking and health and
- 22 say publicly what it had been saying privately for
- 23 years?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 25 overbroad.

- 1 A. I mean, to try and respond to your question, do
- 2 you have any particular head of R&D in mind?
- 3 Q. How about Dr. Green?
- 4 A. I mean, I've seen a variety of -- of -- of
- 5 writings of Dr. Green, who was at R&D for some time
- 6 and -- and wrote a considerable number of -- of memos
- 7 in relation to smoking and health. I gather that
- 8 there may be some of those memos that -- that make a
- 9 suggestion in terms of discussing causality, but in
- 10 general my view again is of what British-American
- 11 Tobacco has done in terms of its -- its -- its
- 12 views and its actions in relation to smoking and
- 13 health I believe have been consistent and
- 14 responsible.
- 15 Q. Now, sir, isn't it a fact that BATCO has known
- 16 that if you examine the medical research, you will
- 17 find more smokers are likely to suffer disease than
- 18 nonsmokers?
- 19 A. If you look at epidemiological studies of -- of
- 20 groups of people in -- in different parts of the
- 21 world, it is generally the fact that what you'll find
- 22 is a higher instance of lung cancer in the group that
- 23 are smokers compared to the group that are
- 24 nonsmokers.
- 25 Q. Well that fact is unquestionable, isn't it,

- 1 sir?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.
- 3 A. I wasn't questioning that. What I was -- I was
- 4 trying to say is that what the scientific data has --
- 5 has shown. The -- I mean, the -- the studies have
- 6 been published for many years starting in the 1950s
- 7 and -- and continue to be published today, and
- 8 although those studies give different relative risks
- 9 between the two groups depending somewhat upon the
- 10 country; for example, data in China and Japan would
- 11 be quite different from data in the United States and
- 12 in the U.K., generally it has been found that groups
- 13 of smokers have a higher instance of lung cancer than
- 14 groups of nonsmokers in such epidemiological
- 15 studies.
- 16 Q. Well did BATCO ever tell the people who smoked
- 17 its cigarettes that if you examine the medical
- 18 research, you will find that more smokers are likely
- 19 to suffer from disease than nonsmokers?
- 20 A. I mean, in the -- certainly any public
- 21 statements I make refer to smoking being an important
- 22 risk factor. That refers exactly to that point. I
- 23 think in terms of people's general understanding
- 24 way -- way back in terms of the 1950s when these
- 25 issues were first debated, as the first scientific

- 1 studies on -- on epidemiological studies on smoking
- 2 and health were published, I think that's a matter
- 3 that was -- was publicized very broadly in the public
- 4 arena.
- 5 Q. Well, sir, I'm not talking about the public
- 6 health area here. I'm not talking about the
- 7 governments, and I'm not talking about the
- 8 universities. I'm talking about BATCO.
- 9 Did BATCO ever come out and say to people
- 10 smoking its cigarettes, "If you examine the medical
- 11 research, it is unquestionable that you will find
- 12 that more smokers are likely to suffer disease than
- 13 nonsmokers"?
- 14 MR. SHEFFLER: I object, move to strike
- 15 counsel's comments; they're inappropriate. As far as
- 16 her question, it was asked and it was answered
- 17 responsively, and I object.
- 18 A. And again, I mean, the response is that for many
- 19 years British-American Tobacco's view of the science
- 20 is that smoking is a risk factor for certain
- 21 diseases. What -- what my understanding of that term
- 22 means is that there are statistical associations as
- 23 shown in epidemiological studies which show that
- 24 groups of smokers have in those -- in such studies a
- 25 higher instance of lung cancer than nonsmokers.

- 1 Q. Sir, I'm not talking about risk factors and I'm
- 2 not talking about statistical associations. I'm
- 3 asking you isn't it a fact that BATCO never ever has
- 4 told people who smoke its cigarettes that if you look
- 5 at the medical literature, that it is unquestionable
- 6 that smokers are more likely to get disease than
- 7 nonsmokers?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. That question
- 9 has been asked and answered three times. And I also
- 10 object to the dramatic predicate of counsel and move
- 11 to strike.
- 12 A. My answer to that question is you can't separate
- 13 statistical studies from that question because that's
- 14 precisely the information on which is gained the
- 15 knowledge that the incidence of lung cancer in groups
- 16 of smokers and in epidemiological studies is higher
- 17 than groups of nonsmokers. The two are inextricably
- 18 combined in terms of the scientific arena.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Do you think we could --
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Absolutely. We'll take a
- 21 break. We've been going an hour.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 23 (Recess taken.)
- 24 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 596 was marked
- for identification.)

- 1 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 2 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 3 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 596, this is a document that
- 4 begins with the Bates number 103366389; correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. All right. And it's entitled "CACVIII,
- 7 PROPOSITION"; right?
- 8 A. Yeah, it's "CAC." I assume it's Roman numerals
- 9 for -- for "VIII." It's V-I-I-I.
- 10 Q. All right. And you understand that the "CAC"
- 11 is -- refers to the "Chairman's Advisory Committee";
- 12 right?
- 13 A. I know "CAC" can stand for the "Chairman's
- 14 Advisory Committee." I'm not sure from -- from the
- 15 document I have in front of me that's what it stands
- 16 for, but it could stand for that.
- 17 Q. Well you understood that there were meetings of
- 18 the Chairman's Advisory Committee that were
- 19 enumerated with Roman numerals; right?
- 20 A. Actually I'm -- I'm not sure whether all of
- 21 their meetings were enumerated with -- with Roman
- 22 numerals or not.
- 23 Q. All right. Would you turn to the page that ends
- 24 with Bates number 392.
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. Do you see a box at the -- toward the bottom of
- 2 the page?
- 3 A. There's a series of paragraphs that have been
- 4 outlined by a -- a box, almost kind of a spacing, one
- 5 bit of it.
- 6 Q. And it --
- 7 The first sentence of that box says "IT IS
- 8 UNQUESTIONABLE THAT IF YOU EXAMINE THE MEDICAL
- 9 RESEARCH YOU WILL FIND THAT MORE SMOKERS ARE LIKELY
- 10 TO SUFFER FROM DISEASES THAN NON-SMOKERS"; right?
- 11 A. That's what it says, yeah.
- 12 Q. And it goes on to say "BUT DOCTORS BELIEVE
- 13 EVIDENCE IS SUFFICIENT TO SHOW CAUSALITY" in the next
- 14 paragraph; right?
- 15 A. Well it goes on to say that "THIS IS" A "FACT.
- 16 BUT THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT IF YOU SMOKE YOU
- 17 AUTOMATICALLY BECOME ILL. MOST SMOKERS DO NOT
- 18 SUFFER." Full stop. Then it says, "BUT DOCTORS
- 19 BELIEVE EVIDENCE IS SUFFICIENT TO SHOW CAUSALITY."
- 20 Q. All right. Sir, BATCO never issued a press
- 21 release that said it is unquestionable that if you
- 22 examine the medical research you will find that more
- 23 smokers are likely to suffer from disease than
- 24 nonsmokers; isn't that true, sir?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection.

- 1 A. I can't remember a press release which gives
- 2 that precise information, but, I mean, what that says
- 3 is that -- that smoking is a risk factor for various
- 4 diseases, and that I think has certainly been the
- 5 statement we have -- have made on inquiry for many,
- 6 many years and the statement I made earlier today in
- 7 terms of trying to -- to put forth the view of
- 8 British-American Tobacco on -- on precisely this --
- 9 this type of research.
- 10 Q. Sir, has British-American Tobacco Company ever
- 11 taken out or issued a press release saying that
- 12 cigarette smoking was toxic?
- 13 A. Have we written a press release which stated
- 14 specifically cigarette smoking is toxic? As far as
- 15 I'm aware, not.
- 16 Q. All right. And isn't it a fact that Richard
- 17 Green -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 18 Isn't it a fact that Steven Green, head of
- 19 research and development for BATCO, held that
- 20 opinion?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. I -- lack of
- 22 foundation. There was no foundation laid that any
- 23 Steven Green was ever head of research and
- 24 development for BATCO.
- 25 A. To try and respond to your question in a helpful

- 1 way, if you mean Dr. Green, who was head of research
- 2 for some time at British-American Tobacco, I mean, he
- 3 wrote extensively on this matter, and -- and as far
- 4 as I can tell from what I've read from -- of -- of
- 5 his writings, that in the majority of those writings
- 6 he -- he looks at a working hypothesis and in terms
- 7 of relation to -- to smoking and -- and disease and
- 8 whether those statistical relations can be
- 9 interpreted as -- as being causal.
- 10 Q. Sir --
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 12 Exhibit 501.
- 13 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 501 was handed
- to the witness.)
- 15 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 16 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 17 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 18 as Exhibit 501, this is a memo from Dr. S. J. Green
- 19 to Patrick Sheehy, who was chair of B.A.T.
- 20 Industries; correct?
- 21 A. The date is 17th of the 5th, 1976. I'm not sure
- 22 whether P. Sheehy was chair of B.A.T. Industries at
- 23 that time, but it certainly is a letter from S. J.
- 24 Green to P. Sheehy, Esquire -- Esquire.
- 25 Q. And he encloses comments on a paper, doesn't

- 1 he?
- 2 A. I -- I'd need to read it. Can I just spend a
- 3 bit of time reading this?
- 4 Q. Well, sir, you can tell from the first page that
- 5 he encloses comments on a paper, doesn't he?
- 6 A. Well I haven't even had a chance to read that
- 7 first page. I'm sorry. If I can just read the --
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: It's a brief paragraph.
- 9 Just let him read the paragraph, Counsel.
- 10 A. Yeah, I've read the first paragraph.
- 11 Q. And he encloses comments on a paper, doesn't
- 12 he?
- 13 A. What he says is "You might care to see my
- 14 comments on the Kalhok," if that's the correct
- 15 pronunciation, "and Short paper."
- 16 Q. Now if we turn to the next page, his comments
- 17 begin there, don't they, sir?
- 18 A. Well it's -- the next page says "THE EFFECT OF
- 19 RESTRICTIONS ON CURRENT MARKETING AND MARKETING IN
- 20 THE FUTURE," and I don't know whether that refers to
- 21 this Kalhok and Short paper or not.
- 22 Q. It --
- 23 This page is consecutively Bates numbered
- 24 following the first page of Exhibit 501; right?
- 25 A. The number is 28, following 27.

- 1 Q. Now, sir, would you take a look at the last
- 2 paragraph on the second page of the document. There
- 3 he says "In view of the known toxicity and the strong
- 4 association of smoking and disease I believe any
- 5 attempt to increase the smoking habit is
- 6 irresponsible"; correct?
- 7 A. Point four, which is -- which is under something
- 8 called "Comments on Conclusions," says "In view of
- 9 the known toxicity and the strong association of
- 10 smoking and disease I believe any attempt to increase
- 11 the smoking habit is irresponsible. Equally I
- 12 believe it .. irresponsible to exaggerate the dangers
- 13 in order to decrease the habit, "but I'm uncertain as
- 14 to what he's referring to in terms of his review of
- 15 this paper.
- 16 Q. Now, sir, did BATCO at any time issue a press
- 17 release saying that smoking was knowingly toxic --
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: I object --
- 19 Q. -- or was toxic?
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to that misuse of
- 21 this document. As reflected on the first page, these
- 22 are Dr. Green's comments, not R&D comments, as he so
- 23 states, and it's a misuse of the document.
- MS. WIVELL: Object to your coaching the
- 25 witness.

- 1 A. Could you -- sorry, could you ask the question
- 2 again.
- 3 Q. Certainly I will.
- 4 Now, at any time did BATCO issue a press release
- 5 saying that smoking was toxic?
- 6 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, same objection,
- 7 and also asked and answered.
- 8 A. I mean, to my understanding, British-American
- 9 Tobacco Company has not issued a press release, which
- 10 presumably a press release would require there to be
- 11 some news involved, saying that tobacco smoke was
- 12 known to be toxic. Having said that, of course it is
- 13 the -- the views of the public health authorities
- 14 that have been promoted out there. It is also pretty
- 15 clear in terms of health warnings that are -- are --
- 16 are present on -- on packages of cigarettes what
- 17 views are, and I'm not sure really -- I mean, I can
- 18 answer your question obviously precisely, and the
- 19 answer is no, but in terms of what impact that has on
- 20 the -- I mean, I'll let you ask me the questions.
- 21 Q. Move to strike the portion of the answer
- 22 beginning with "Having said that."
- Now, sir, has B.A.T. Industries ever issued a
- 24 press release saying that cigarette smoking is
- 25 toxic?

- 1 A. It is my understanding that British -- B.A.T.
- 2 Industries has never issued precisely a -- a press
- 3 release which says that cigarette smoking is toxic.
- 4 And again, I mean, in terms of trying to help an
- 5 understanding of where this -- this question comes
- 6 from, I mean, it's clear from British-American
- 7 Tobacco's point of view that those types of issues
- 8 have been discussed in public, and one would imagine
- 9 the only time you would issue a press release, if
- 10 there was something that was news. I mean, that --
- 11 that tends to be, I believe, the reason you would
- 12 issue a press release, and I don't think any of the
- 13 issues we're discussing here are news to the general
- 14 public.
- 15 Therefore, I would not have expected
- 16 British-American Tobacco to issue a press release on
- 17 something which was clearly not news but instead the
- 18 general view of the population based on what the
- 19 public health authorities have said.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, let me ask you this: Isn't it a fact
- 21 that the B.A.T. Group did inhalation studies that
- 22 showed -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- Isn't it a fact that the B.A.T. Group did
- 24 inhalation studies on rodent species that
- 25 demonstrated that their exposure to cigarette smoke

- 1 caused respiratory tract tumors?
- 2 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, lack of
- 3 foundation.
- 4 A. I mean, the answer is -- is no in any -- any
- 5 scientifically acceptable manner. If I can try and
- 6 help you in responding to the type of research that
- 7 British-American Tobacco had done on inhalation, it
- 8 really very much parallels research that's been done
- 9 in the -- the general academic community in trying to
- 10 provide or -- or to produce animal tests which would
- 11 under conditions where animals were inhaling tobacco
- 12 smoke, those animals would -- would get lung tumors
- 13 of some sort, as -- as -- as you all know. And the
- 14 U.S. Surgeon General has -- has looked at that
- 15 information and -- and said that it's not been
- 16 possible to do that in any scientific valid manner.
- 17 I think that's exactly the -- the case also with
- 18 research that was undertaken at British-American
- 19 Tobacco.
- 20 Q. Well just so we're clear here, there was
- 21 research undertaken at British-American Tobacco
- 22 Company exposing rodent species to tobacco smoke;
- 23 right?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. All right. And those -- I'm sorry.

- 1 That research demonstrated an increased
- 2 incidence of lung tumors in the animals exposed to
- 3 the cigarette smoke; right?
- 4 A. No, that's incorrect. What -- what I understand
- 5 of -- of that research is -- is one of the -- the
- 6 long-term studies found one lung tumor type in -- in
- 7 one of the animals that was exposed to smoke and one
- 8 in the same group of the sham exposed; that means
- 9 those that weren't exposed to tobacco smoke. And in
- 10 terms of trying to interpret those types of
- 11 scientific data, what -- what people do is, because
- 12 obviously these types of matters can happen
- 13 spontaneously, you look for significant differences
- 14 statistically between two groups of animals.
- 15 And as -- as far as I'm aware, that wasn't found
- 16 in any research undertaken by British-American
- 17 Tobacco, nor has it generally been found in research
- 18 undertaken by the general academic community.
- 19 Q. Well, sir, I'm focusing just on the research
- 20 that was done at British-American Tobacco Company.
- 21 Isn't it a fact that most of the animals died before
- 22 they could even live long enough to develop tumors?
- 23 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form.
- 24 That --
- 25 A. Well, I mean, in any scientific experiment on --

- 1 on animals where you're looking for an endpoint, I
- 2 mean, clearly what you do is controls versus cases.
- 3 If the animals were dying in the controls, then
- 4 cases, it wouldn't be a very useful experiment. It
- 5 was my understanding of the research that people
- 6 tried both short-term and -- and long-term inhalation
- 7 tests, and again just as the general scientific
- 8 community has found, it has not been possible to
- 9 validate inhalation as -- as a useful test in -- in
- 10 terms of trying to understand smoking-and-health
- 11 issues.
- 12 Q. Well so as a result, the human experiment on
- 13 people smoking continued because you couldn't do the
- 14 experiment on animals; isn't that right?
- 15 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, lack of
- 16 foundation. Objection, ambiguous and vague as to
- 17 "human experiment" has not been defined.
- 18 A. I don't know what at all you mean by "the human
- 19 experiment."
- 20 Q. Okay. Well let me ask you this: I think you
- 21 told us -- correct me if I'm wrong -- that it wasn't
- 22 possible to do experiments exposing animals to
- 23 inhalation studies to determine whether or not those
- 24 studies produced lung tumors. Is that right?
- 25 A. It's been -- sorry.

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Go ahead.
- 2 A. Oh. I mean, it's been the general scientific
- 3 experience, as is clearly documented in the U.S.
- 4 Surgeon General's report, that it's not been possible
- 5 to develop inhalation tests in animals that have
- 6 produced to a sufficient scientific quality lung
- 7 tumors in -- in those animals. I think it's a matter
- 8 that actually continues to be researched today.
- 9 There's an institute called the Lovelace Institute in
- 10 the United States that continues today to attempt to
- 11 find a specific animal model which will respond to
- 12 inhalation, and when they published research even a
- 13 year ago, they said, "No, we still can't find an
- 14 animal model which will induce human-type lung tumors
- 15 in -- in -- in these animals," but they continue to
- 16 do that research.
- 17 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that a scientist in
- 18 Germany by the name of Dontenwill using Syrian golden
- 19 hamsters produced results which showed there was a
- 20 dose/response relationship between the exposure to
- 21 cigarette smoke and lung tumors? I'm sorry, of
- 22 cigarette smoke and respiratory tract tumors?
- 23 A. I mean, there clearly have been some experiments
- 24 which -- which have shown changes in laboratory
- 25 animals, and you're right, there is a study by

- 1 Dontenwill which looks at Syrian golden hamsters. I
- 2 mean, that study is one which has formed part of the
- 3 scientific information in the public domain. It's --
- 4 it's certainly part of the research that the United
- 5 States Surgeon General reviewed when he came to the
- 6 conclusion that animal inhalation tests have simply
- 7 not been able to provide a useful test in terms of
- 8 trying to assess what may be happening in the human
- 9 condition.
- 10 Q. Now the tobacco industry, including BATCO, tried
- 11 to continue those experiments, didn't they?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, vague.
- 13 A. I mean, it is -- it is clear that
- 14 British-American Tobacco have attempted to undertake
- 15 research, just as the general scientific community
- 16 has, on inhalation of tobacco smoke in -- in
- 17 laboratory animals, yes.
- 18 Q. And a clear dose/response relationship emerged
- 19 from those studies that BATCO did; isn't that true?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, vague.
- 21 A. Again, I -- I tried to respond to this before.
- 22 It's my understanding that that research reported no
- 23 difference between those that were exposed to smoke
- 24 and those which we called the sham controls, in that
- 25 of the group of animals, one -- just one animal that

- 1 was exposed to smoke was found to have a tumor and
- 2 one of those which was not exposed to smoke was also
- 3 found to have a tumor. These types of animals, I
- 4 gather, can get these types of tumors spontaneously,
- 5 and so there was clearly no difference at all, let
- 6 alone a statistical difference, between those two
- 7 groups.
- 8 Q. Well and isn't it a fact that there was no
- 9 statistical difference because most of the group that
- 10 was exposed to smoke died before they could develop
- 11 any tumors?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to form.
- 13 A. I mean, that's not my understanding of -- of the
- 14 research, but if that were to be the case, I mean,
- 15 that's an experiment that you would have to repeat.
- 16 And again, the scientific community has attempted for
- 17 years to -- trying to do such studies. And as I
- 18 said, I mean, even as of a year ago there are
- 19 research establishments in the United States who
- 20 continued to undertake such research to try and find
- 21 an animal modelable -- I'm sorry, an animal model
- 22 that would be relevant to human health.
- 23 Q. All right. But in the meantime while this
- 24 attempt to try and find an animal model to expose
- 25 smoke, cigarette smoke, to went on, the B.A.T. Group

- 1 kept selling cigarettes; right?
- 2 A. British-American Tobacco has sold cigarettes for
- 3 many years. That is clearly the case. Knowledge in
- 4 relation to biological mechanisms related to the
- 5 associations that have been identified between
- 6 smoking and disease --
- 7 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you read
- 8 that back. I'm not sure what I was saying at the end
- 9 there.
- 10 (Record read by the court reporter.)
- 11 A. -- continues to be sought, and that takes a
- 12 variety of -- of -- of different routes in -- in
- 13 terms of the science. Some of that research has --
- 14 has been involved in looking at inhalation studies,
- 15 but research continues.
- 16 The fact is, is the public health authorities
- 17 have given a view and given a view to the public in
- 18 terms of smoking and health. The fact is that there
- 19 is no country in the world, as far as I know, that
- 20 has made cigarettes illegal. The fact is that --
- 21 that cigarettes certainly carry health warnings that
- 22 the governments asked us to put on, and even in
- 23 countries where governments have not asked us to put
- 24 on we put on health warnings as a matter of -- of a
- 25 general standard. And people take their -- their

- 1 informed choice as to whether they should smoke or
- 2 not.
- 3 Q. Well, sir, did British-American ever --
- 4 British-American Tobacco Company or any of the B.A.T.
- 5 Group companies ever tell smokers that they were part
- 6 of a large human experiment?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, assumes facts not
- 8 in evidence.
- 9 A. It's my understanding that we have never told
- 10 smokers they are part of a -- a -- what, a human
- 11 experiment? No.
- 12 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 597 was marked
- for identification.)
- 14 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 15 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 16 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 17 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 597, this is a document Bates
- 18 numbered 105318954; correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. And it's entitled "Conference on Inhalation
- 21 Toxicology, Group Research and Development Centre,
- 22 Southampton 7 9 August 1974"; right?
- 23 A. That's right.
- 24 Q. Sir, could you turn to the page that's Bates
- 25 numbered 956.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. Do you see the first complete paragraph that
- 3 begins with the sentence "But are assumptions of this
- 4 kind necessarily so bad?"
- 5 A. I see that.
- 6 Q. It goes on to say "The tobacco industry has
- 7 become involved in the investigation of the
- 8 biological consequences of smoking as a result of the
- 9 outcome of a large dose/response experiment. In this
- 10 experiment no dosimetry was used, there was no
- 11 control over the frequency of smoking or the
- 12 concentration of smoke used, and there was no attempt
- 13 at random distribution of the test animals to the
- 14 various levels of exposure. And yet a clear
- 15 dose/response relationship emerged"; correct?
- 16 A. That's just read directly out of this document,
- 17 and I'd also perhaps refer to the first page of the
- 18 document, which says "These comments are a personal
- 19 reflection upon the outcome of ... three days
- 20 proceedings," and I don't know who was the author of
- 21 these personal reflections. I guess an E. B.
- 22 Wilkes.
- 23 Q. And this person who wrote this paper goes on to
- 24 say "I am referring of course to the epidemiological
- 25 study of the smoking habit in man"; right?

- 1 A. That's what he says here as his personal
- 2 reflection, yes.
- 3 Q. All right. And he goes on to say "But now,
- 4 after many and various epidemiological studies, few
- 5 people doubt the existence of a dose/response
- 6 relationship in men"; correct?
- 7 A. That's what it says here.
- 8 Q. All right. He goes on at the bottom of that
- 9 page to talk about "the human experiment will
- 10 continue, doesn't he, sir?
- 11 A. He says that as part of these personal
- 12 reflections, yes, at the bottom of the page.
- 13 Q. He says "Whether we like it or not, the human
- 14 experiment will continue ..."; right?
- 15 A. He says that and goes on to say "and will be
- 16 monitored by many" of those "whose sole objective is
- 17 to discredit the tobacco industry." I'm not quite
- 18 sure what he means by that, but --
- 19 Q. All right.
- 20 A. -- that's what he said as part of his personal
- 21 reflection, yeah.
- 22 Q. And, sir, none of the B.A.T. Group ever told any
- 23 smoker who was purchasing their cigarettes that they
- 24 were part of a human experiment?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, lack

- 1 of foundation.
- 2 A. Absolutely not, and I think, I mean, what you've
- 3 referred to here are some personal reflections by --
- 4 by someone who I believe was -- was at Southampton
- 5 giving some, I mean, views which are his own views.
- 6 I mean, British-American Tobacco doesn't take a view
- 7 that there is a human experiment going on here.
- 8 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that there has been a
- 9 human experiment in epidemiolog -- epidemiology which
- 10 has gone on over the last 40 years?
- 11 A. No. I mean, epidemiological studies have for
- 12 the last 40 years looked at groups of people; for
- 13 example, compare groups of smokers compared to groups
- 14 of nonsmokers to identify differences in diseases. I
- 15 mean, you could make the same statement there is a
- 16 human experiment on -- on people who eat butter, I
- 17 mean, in terms of identifying various relative risks
- 18 in relation to various diseases; for example, heart
- 19 disease.
- 20 So, I mean, the fact that epidemiological
- 21 studies go on and -- and -- and as part of, I mean,
- 22 general science doesn't seem to give me an indication
- 23 that there's any sort of human experiment. Clearly
- 24 epidemiological studies of -- of the nature that look
- 25 at smokers versus nonsmokers are human, on humans,

- 1 but --
- 2 Q. Well, sir --
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Let him finish, please.
- 4 A. -- but, I mean, I can't -- I wouldn't describe
- 5 this as a big 40-year human experiment, no.
- 6 Q. Well clearly more than 40 years ago there were
- 7 articles published in the press -- or I'm sorry,
- 8 articles published in the scientific literature which
- 9 suggested that smoking causes cancer; right?
- 10 A. There were articles published in the 1950s which
- 11 identified a statistical association between smoking
- 12 and -- and lung cancer in the first case and later
- 13 with various diseases, yes.
- 14 Q. Well let me ask you this: 45 years ago or so
- 15 were -- were there similar studies showing that
- 16 butter was related to lung cancer?
- 17 A. I'm not sure exactly when the first
- 18 epidemiological studies were published showing
- 19 various dietary factors associated with lung cancer,
- 20 but certainly, I mean, that has been part of the
- 21 scientific body of information for some time now.
- 22 Exactly when the first studies were published, I
- 23 don't know.
- 24 Q. Well let me ask you this: Before cigarettes
- 25 were marketed, were there any epidemiological studies

- 1 carried out to determine whether or not cigarettes
- 2 caused disease?
- 3 A. I'm not sure what -- what you mean by the term
- 4 "marketed." I mean, cigarettes became something
- 5 that people used in the 16th Century or so. Were
- 6 there scientific experiments on -- on --
- 7 epidemiological experiments in the 16th Century? I
- 8 believe not. I don't think it was a technique that
- 9 was used in the 16th Century.
- 10 Q. All right. But you would agree, sir, that the
- 11 wide distribution of cigarettes only came into --
- 12 into existence with the automated cigarette machine,
- 13 wouldn't you?
- 14 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. We're getting
- 15 far afield from the subject matter of this deposition
- 16 which was set forth in the notice 30.02(f). I've
- 17 been -- I've been very lenient with counsel to
- 18 explore these matters she seems to have some interest
- 19 in, but I $\operatorname{--}$ I am going to insist that we return to
- 20 the subject matter of this deposition.
- 21 A. I'm sorry, can you read me back the question
- 22 again.
- 23 Q. Certainly.
- 24 A. I'll try and answer.
- 25 Q. Would you agree that the wide distribution of

- 1 cigarettes only came into existence with the advent
- 2 of the automated cigarette machine?
- 3 A. I don't know. If you -- if you look at the U.K.
- 4 situation, certainly, I mean, it's been commonplace
- 5 for the use of tobacco for -- for -- for many
- 6 centuries. I was actually trying to find here a
- 7 quote from the Surgeon General's report that would be
- 8 more precise to your answer in terms of usage. There
- 9 certainly are -- if I spent some time to dig this
- 10 out, will give you a reference to exactly -- exactly
- 11 how common the usage of tobacco's been over the
- 12 centuries.
- 13 Q. Well let me ask you this: When those studies
- 14 were published in the literature in the mid-'50s
- 15 that showed an association between cigarette smoking
- 16 and lung disease, did British-American Tobacco
- 17 Company start an epidemiological study to determine
- 18 whether or not that statistical association was
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. No, I don't believe we started an
- 21 epidemiological study. What happened is the general
- 22 scientific community started epidemiological studies
- 23 as an issue. You can see, for example, in the report
- 24 I have here, which is -- which is the report of the
- 25 Royal College of Physicians of London, which was

- 1 written in 1962, and it was a variety of -- of
- 2 epidemial studies -- epidemiological studies that
- 3 went on at that time and it was the view certainly of
- 4 the Royal College of Physicians, which was -- was
- 5 also I guess in -- in this American version copied to
- 6 various public health authorities or public health
- 7 interests in the United States, that a body of
- 8 research was developing that shows that -- that
- 9 smoking was a risk factor for lung cancer.
- 10 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, I am not
- 11 talking about what the public health authorities
- 12 did. I'm asking about what BATCO did. Did BATCO --
- When Dr. Wynder first published his articles
- 14 about smoking and lung cancer, did BATCO start an
- 15 epidemiological study to determine whether or not
- 16 that was true?
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the statement
- 18 of counsel, move to strike. Objection, asked and
- 19 answered.
- 20 A. Let me try and explain and to help exactly what
- 21 British-American Tobacco has done since -- since the
- 22 Wynder and also obviously in the U.K. the Doll
- 23 British doctor studies were published. Very early
- 24 on, within -- in the history of that science, what
- 25 British-American Tobacco did was obviously start

- 1 looking at the scientific developments in the
- 2 external literature, started funding independent
- 3 research in relation to -- to smoking and disease and
- 4 also established a research center which started a --
- 5 a program which has gone on for -- for many decades
- 6 trying to understand fundamentals of the product,
- 7 including chemistry, which in those days was pretty
- 8 poorly understood, and as we've been talking about
- 9 recently, right through to trying to identify a
- 10 variety of either animal or laboratory tests which
- 11 would assist our understanding of the
- 12 smoking-and-health issues.
- 13 Q. And so the answer is no, BATCO did not
- 14 internally start an epidemiological study to
- 15 determine whether or not smoking was
- 16 epidemiologically associated with disease; --
- 17 MR. SHEFFLER: The answer --
- 18 Q. -- isn't that true, sir?
- MR. SHEFFLER: The answer was given and the
- 20 answer is the answer. And the question was asked and
- 21 answered.
- 22 A. I mean, the answer is that British-American
- 23 Tobacco immediately started to fund independent
- 24 research on -- on smoking and health and it -- it
- 25 started up a whole series of programs of research

- 1 in-house. I mean, in terms of epidemiological data,
- 2 that developed quite rapidly in the external
- 3 literature. There was no point, in -- in my view, to
- 4 try and repeat a study if the -- the general
- 5 scientific community is -- is creating that study.
- 6 It would be duplicative.
- 7 What clearly we did is look at developments in
- 8 that research. It's been our view for many, many
- 9 years based on the epidemiological studies that
- 10 smoking's a risk factor. I mean, that's what those
- 11 studies have said. What epidemiology does is sets up
- 12 hypotheses. It says there is some association
- 13 between a particular action and a particular disease,
- 14 and what that then leads you to is really laboratory
- 15 studies to try and identify why, if that is a true
- 16 association, what is going on.
- 17 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 598 was marked
- for identification.)
- 19 THE WITNESS: Thanks.
- 20 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 21 Q. Before we turn to Exhibit 598, you have
- 22 mentioned extensive laboratory analyses that were
- 23 done by BATCO. Now you would agree that these
- 24 extensive laboratory analyses that were done showed
- 25 that tobacco contains specific nitrosamine compounds

- 1 which are known carcinogens; right?
- 2 A. Some of -- of these research efforts have been
- 3 to identify methods to be able to detect
- 4 tobacco-specific nitrosamines, which are a group of
- 5 compounds which under animal experiments at high
- 6 doses have been shown to be animal carcinogens.
- 7 Q. All right. Now, BATCO has known for years that
- 8 there are nitrosamine -- tobacco-specific
- 9 nitrosamines in cigarette smoke; right?
- 10 A. British-American Tobacco, as -- as I've tried to
- 11 state in terms of all of these scientific
- 12 developments, has looked at where the -- the
- 13 scientific community has been suggesting there are
- 14 elements within tobacco smoke that may be of concern,
- 15 and tobacco-specific nitrosamines certainly in
- 16 particular through the research of the American
- 17 Health Foundation have been one group of those
- 18 substances that have been identified. And yes,
- 19 British-American Tobacco has -- has developed
- 20 techniques whereby it could identify tobacco-specific
- 21 nitrosamines in tobacco smoke.
- 22 Q. And when BATCO identified the tobacco-specific
- 23 nitrosamines in cigarette smoke, did it tell the
- 24 people who were smoking their cigarettes that there
- 25 were these carcinogenic compounds in the smoke that

- 1 they were inhaling in their lungs?
- 2 A. If the question is did we again set off a press
- 3 release saying, "There are tobacco-specific
- 4 nitrosamines in tobacco smoke, " your answer is no. I
- 5 think that's not again surprising given that press
- 6 releases and such would -- would try and tell people
- 7 something that's new. Certainly at the time that we
- 8 were doing research on -- on tobacco-specific
- 9 nitrosamines, it was the general knowledge of the
- 10 public as promoted by the public health authorities
- 11 that smoking was a cause of lung cancer.
- 12 So for us to -- to tell people in a press
- 13 release that we've identified some substances that in
- 14 animal tests have shown to be animal carcinogens I
- 15 don't think would have added to that -- that
- 16 knowledge within the public.
- 17 Q. Well and you didn't add to that knowledge within
- 18 the public, did -- did you, sir?
- 19 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The question was
- 20 asked and answered.
- 21 A. And again, the answer is there was no need to do
- 22 so. In fact, I mean, what was being clearly stated
- 23 was -- was far in advance of -- of something which
- 24 may be -- have been a -- you know, a response to the
- 25 fact that you could measure as the general scientific

- 1 community had measured substances in tobacco smoke
- 2 which -- which have been shown in -- in animal
- 3 studies to be animal carcinogens.
- 4 Q. Well, sir, did -- did BATCO or any of the B.A.T.
- 5 Group companies ever tell the people who smoked their
- 6 cigarettes that there's no known safe level of
- 7 nitrosamines in cigarette smoke?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form,
- 9 assumes facts not in evidence.
- 10 A. Again, as far as I'm aware, it has never been
- 11 something that British-American Tobacco has done in
- 12 terms of telling the general public that there is no
- 13 known safe level of tobacco-specific nitrosamines.
- 14 That is certainly one scientific view in -- in
- 15 relation to -- to -- to substances which are shown to
- 16 be carcinogenic in -- in animal studies, though not
- 17 always a consistent view in terms of whether there
- 18 are thresholds for carcinogenesis.
- 19 The fact is again, I mean, whether -- I mean, we
- 20 were clearly not making press releases on all these
- 21 matters, but -- but clearly through both health
- 22 warnings that appeared on packages, through what was
- 23 being stated in -- in the general media from public
- 24 health authorities, from governments, people's views
- 25 were that -- that smoking was a cause of lung cancer,

- 1 and certainly also in terms of -- of more
- 2 specifically your point, I don't think there has ever
- 3 been a view promoted by a public health authority to
- 4 say that -- that smoking was safe in any way.
- 5 Q. Well, sir, BATCO knew there was no safe level
- 6 for nitrosamines; isn't that true?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 8 question, lack of foundation.
- 9 A. I mean, again, I mean, let me try and explain
- 10 what the data is in relation to tobacco-specific
- 11 nitrosamines and what the general scientific
- 12 community has said on this. Tobacco-specific
- 13 nitrosamines if applied in high doses in animals can
- 14 result in -- in tumors in those animals. Whether
- 15 that is then the case that tobacco-specific
- 16 nitrosamines in the levels which are -- are very
- 17 small found in tobacco smoke can give cause to lung
- 18 cancer in humans isn't entirely certain.
- 19 And as you look through the scientific
- 20 evaluation of what may and may not be a compound or a
- 21 series of compounds in tobacco smoke which may be
- 22 giving rise to the association found between smoking
- 23 and, for example, lung cancer, you will find that
- 24 it's a variety of different compounds that have been
- 25 promoted as perhaps the most important. The -- first

- 1 of all it was things like benzopyrene; that was
- 2 something that Dr. Wynder was suggesting. Much later
- 3 it was the American Health Foundation group
- 4 suggesting it was nitrosamines.
- 5 I think it's been, I mean, stated -- and I -- if
- 6 I had the time, I could dig it out of these
- 7 reports -- stated by the U.S. Surgeon General and by
- 8 other public health authorities that it has not been
- 9 possible to identify any particular substance that,
- 10 in their view, could be -- explain the relationship
- 11 between -- that is found in the statistical studies,
- 12 and therefore it's not been possible to -- I mean,
- 13 for either the public health authorities or for
- 14 ourselves to be able to say, "Well this is the
- 15 substance that needs to be removed from tobacco
- 16 smoke."
- 17 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 18 question is very simple.
- 19 BATCO knew there were no safe levels of -- for
- 20 nitrosamines; isn't that true?
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: That question was asked and
- 22 answered, and I object to counsel's predicate
- 23 statement.
- 24 A. I mean, again if you go to what the scientific
- 25 data says, you will find if you expose laboratory

- 1 animals to tobacco-specific nitrosamines at high
- 2 concentrations, you will find tumors. What relevance
- 3 that has to exposure to low levels of
- 4 tobacco-specific nitrosamines to -- to humans is
- 5 clear -- is unclear, and there has never been a time
- 6 where the -- where the public health authorities or
- 7 the medical/scientific community has said, "Right,
- 8 this is the one substance we believe has to be
- 9 removed from tobacco smoke, and if one were to do
- 10 that, it would be safe in some fashion."
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 12 Exhibit 436, please.
- 13 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)
- 14 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 15 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 16 as Exhibit 436, this is a BATCO document; isn't that
- 17 true?
- 18 A. Let me see. It doesn't give me any indication
- 19 here that it's a BATCO document. What it says at the
- 20 top, it says "Nitrosamines: A Brief Summary," and
- 21 then it --
- 22 Q. Well it says re -- "RESTRICTED, Nitrosamines: A
- 23 Brief Summary, "doesn't it, sir?
- 24 A. Well there's a handwritten part on here which
- 25 says "RESTRICTED" underlined.

- 1 Q. And then --
- 2 A. I'm sorry. I mean, there's no, I mean,
- 3 indication to me here on this piece of paper you've
- 4 just given me that this is a document from BATCO or
- 5 anywhere else.
- 6 Q. Well doesn't it say so at the bottom? It says
- 7 "BAT Co Limited Minnesota Tobacco Litigation."
- 8 A. All right.
- 9 Q. Do you see that?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to that. It
- 11 doesn't mean that it's -- it could come from anywhere
- 12 and be found in BATCO's files, Counsel. You know
- 13 that. That's -- that's ambiguous and unfair.
- 14 A. Yeah, and I'm sorry, I don't fully understand
- 15 the way these documents are -- are collected for
- 16 tobacco litigation, but I did assume that the --
- 17 this -- this bit at the bottom has been on all the
- 18 documents so far and so it's not specific to any
- 19 individual document.
- 20 Q. Now, sir, at the top of the document it says
- 21 "Carcinogenicity"; right?
- 22 A. After saying "RESTRICTED" in handwritten,
- 23 underlined "Nitrosamines: A Brief Summary," it then
- 24 says "Carcinogenicity," yes.
- 25 Q. And it says "Nitrosamines are carcinogenic in

- 1 animals at all dose levels examined, irrespective of
- 2 whether they are administered in food, water or by
- 3 inhalation"; correct?
- 4 A. I mean, that's what it says on this document,
- 5 and to which source I'm not sure.
- 6 Q. And then it goes down to the bottom. If we look
- 7 at the second-to-the-last paragraph, it begins "There
- 8 is no 'safe' level for nitrosamines ..."; correct?
- 9 A. And there's a paragraph here which says "There
- 10 is no 'safe' level for nitrosamines and,
- 11 industrially, exposures will have to be reduced to
- 12 the maximum practicable extent consistent with
- 13 continued use, " yeah.
- 14 Q. All right. Now earlier your answer referred to
- 15 tobacco or cigarette packages. Did BATCO or any of
- 16 the B.A.T. Group companies for that matter ever
- 17 voluntarily place a statement on any of its tobacco
- 18 packages, cigarette packages, that there were
- 19 nitrosamines in the cigarettes?
- 20 A. I mean, as far as my understanding goes, no, we
- 21 have never voluntarily placed on a package that there
- 22 are nitrosamines in cigarettes. I know that matter
- 23 has been discussed generally. Whether the general
- 24 public will have any knowledge that nitrosamines are
- 25 present in -- in tobacco smoke, in -- in bacon and a

- 1 variety of other materials, I don't know.
- 2 I think what the message has been to the public
- 3 generally comes through the health warnings and their
- 4 statements, and that is that -- that smoking in the
- 5 view of the public health authorities is a cause of
- 6 lung cancer.
- 7 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that the B.A.T. Group
- 8 companies have never voluntarily placed any warning
- 9 for the cigarette smoker on any of their cigarette
- 10 packages?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 12 prior testimony.
- 13 A. No, that is not correct, and what -- what you
- 14 will see is that in -- in many -- or in several
- 15 countries of the world where the governments hadn't
- 16 set up regulations to require health warnings, we
- 17 have voluntarily put on health warnings on our
- 18 cigarette packages.
- 19 Q. That is after they were required in other
- 20 countries; right?
- 21 A. I mean, I think that may be true in terms of a
- 22 matter of history. What I was trying to -- to
- 23 illustrate as a response to your -- to your previous
- 24 question, that the fact is yes, we have voluntarily
- 25 put on health warnings in countries where there was

- 1 no legal requirement for us to do so.
- 2 Q. Well let's put it this way, state it this way:
- 3 None of the B.A.T. Group companies ever placed a -- a
- 4 warning voluntarily on a cigarette package that was
- 5 sold in the United States; isn't that true?
- 6 A. And I don't know the United States environment
- 7 that well. Your -- your question may well be true.
- 8 Q. And, sir, isn't it a fact that we've seen policy
- 9 documents today which showed that it was B.A.T.
- 10 Industries' policy to fight cigarette warnings on
- 11 packages?
- 12 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, lack of
- 13 foundation, overbroad, vague.
- 14 A. I mean, in the -- in the many documents you
- 15 showed me today, I think I glanced or didn't have an
- 16 opportunity to read something in -- in relation to
- 17 your question there. I mean, I think the fact is
- 18 that British-American Tobacco have gone along with
- 19 public health authorities and put on health warnings,
- 20 and in countries where there wasn't a legal
- 21 requirement to do so, we have put on health warnings
- 22 on our packages as a matter of international
- 23 standard.
- 24 Q. "As a matter of international standard," do you
- 25 mean that because it was done -- it was required

- 1 someplace, that it was put on in other companies to
- 2 be standardized?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form, also
- 4 objection to the mischaracterization of testimony.
- 5 A. No, that wasn't what I meant at all. What I
- 6 meant by that is that since there's a general
- 7 acceptance in the -- in the public health community
- 8 that smoking is a cause of cancer -- of lung cancer,
- 9 sorry, that it -- it seemed appropriate for us to --
- 10 to given that general consensus of view put on health
- 11 warnings voluntarily.
- 12 Q. But it did not --
- 13 The B.A.T. Group did not do so voluntarily in
- 14 the United States, did they?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. Counselor, these
- 16 repetitive questions -- objection to asked and
- 17 answered.
- 18 A. I think I answered that as, to my -- the best of
- 19 my knowledge, no, that was not the case.
- 20 MR. SHEFFLER: Yeah, okay. Let's take a
- 21 break.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 23 (Recess taken.)
- 24 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 25 Q. Sir, I have had the court reporter hand you what

- 1 has been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 598; correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. And that is a document Bates numbered 104745492
- 4 as its first Bates number; right?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And there's some handwritten document -- or some
- 7 handwritten --
- 8 There's some handwriting at the top of the
- 9 document, and under that it says "Conclusions and
- 10 Evaluations"; right?
- 11 A. Yeah. It starts off talking about Lyon and --
- 12 and IARC, then says "V." or Roman numeral "V.
- 13 Conclusions and Evaluations."
- 14 Q. All right. Would you turn your attention to the
- 15 second page of the document.
- 16 MR. SHEFFLER: I'd like the -- I'd like the
- 17 record to reflect the identification of this
- 18 document. I think it's important for the -- for the
- 19 purposes of any questions. I mean, it's -- it's an
- 20 IARC monograph, Volume 3, final draft.
- 21 Q. Sir, turning to the second page of the document,
- 22 the first paragraph says at the end "... extensive
- 23 analysis of smoke shows cigarette smoking to be a
- 24 major source of exposure to tobacco-specific" nitro
- 25 "compounds, polynuclear aromatic compounds, aromatic

- 1 amines and some other carcinogens"; correct?
- 2 A. It says "... tobacco-specific nitroso compounds,
- 3 polynuclear aromatic compounds, aromatic amines and
- 4 some other carcinogens, " yeah.
- 5 Q. All right. Putting the document aside for a --
- 6 a while, you would agree, sir, that in addition to
- 7 the nitrosamine compounds that we were talking about
- 8 earlier, B.A.T. Group analysis of cigarette smoke
- 9 showed that polynuclear aromatic compounds existed
- 10 within cigarette smoke; isn't that true?
- 11 A. I think that's absolutely true, that we've
- 12 identified a variety of polynuclear aromatic
- 13 compounds, sometimes referred to as polyaromatic
- 14 hydrocarbons, I think.
- 15 Q. Right. And is benzopyrene one of those
- 16 polyaromatic hydrocarbons?
- 17 A. Benzopyrene is a polyaromatic hydrocarbon.
- 18 Q. And it --
- 19 It was known within BATCO way back in the '50s
- 20 that benzopyrene was a compound within cigarette
- 21 smoke that was inhaled by smokers; right?
- 22 A. Well it was something that was very much brought
- 23 to the forefront of science by -- by Dr. Wynder in
- 24 the U.S. in terms of identifying benzopyrene as a
- 25 component of tobacco smoke. And yes, I believe our

- 1 research undertaken at British-American Tobacco
- 2 has -- has -- has confirmed what he found, which was
- 3 that benzopyrene is one of the components, albeit at
- 4 fairly low concentrations, in tobacco smoke.
- 5 Q. Well, sir, when --
- 6 When the B.A.T. Group confirmed that benzopyrene
- 7 was something that was being inhaled by smokers as
- 8 part of them taking a puff of a cigarette, did the
- 9 B.A.T. Group inform the public of that confirmation?
- 10 A. I mean, to my knowledge, no. British-American
- 11 Tobacco didn't put out any press release or -- or
- 12 whatever that said that benzopyrene was present in
- 13 tobacco smoke. I mean, that certainly was known in
- 14 terms of the -- in the research community in terms of
- 15 what Dr. Wynder's done and I think in terms -- I
- 16 mean, I don't know whether this is appropriately
- 17 responsive to your question, but as far as I know, no
- 18 other manufacturer of a product that contains --
- 19 contains benzopyrene -- and obviously there are many
- 20 products, food products, which do contain
- 21 benzopyrene -- has ever released to public the fact
- 22 that the benzopyrene's contained in their product.
- 23 Q. Well, sir, we're not talking about a food
- 24 product here. We're talking about something which is
- 25 inhaled in the lungs of smokers, aren't we?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 2 question, argumentative.
- 3 A. And I think if you're talking about tobacco
- 4 smoke, it is clear that some smokers inhale the smoke
- 5 into their respiratory system.
- 6 Q. Sir, and isn't it a fact that when -- back in
- 7 the '50s when BATCO was undertaking research on the
- 8 issue of benzopyrene and cigarette smoke, that it was
- 9 so secretive about that research that it used a code
- 10 name for benzopyrene?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, speculation.
- MR. FRANKEL: Object to form.
- 13 A. I mean, I've heard I think that there was
- 14 perhaps a code name referred to as benzopyrene. The
- 15 fact is that, I mean, the -- the -- the notion or, I
- 16 mean, the scientific data that identified benzopyrene
- 17 in tobacco smoke was common scientific knowledge as
- 18 created by Dr. Wynder and other scientists, so it
- 19 would be surprising that that would be anything that
- 20 one would need to keep secret in that it was -- it
- 21 was public or at least certainly scientific knowledge
- 22 that that was the case.
- 23 Q. Well, sir, it was not scientific knowledge that
- 24 BATCO had confirmed the presence of benzopyrene in
- 25 the tobacco smoke back in the '50s; isn't that true?

- 1 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 2 the testimony.
- 3 A. Did the scientific community understand that
- 4 British-American Tobacco -- I'm not sure quite when
- 5 the experiments were undertaken to be able to
- 6 identify benzopyrene. It's quite a complex thing to
- 7 do. The levels are quite low and it takes pretty
- 8 significant analytical work to be able to measure
- 9 benzopyrene in tobacco smoke.
- 10 When exactly British-American Tobacco achieved
- 11 duplication of the kind of experimental techniques
- 12 that the likes of Dr. Wynder had, I'm uncertain.
- 13 Q. Well isn't it a fact that at the time Wynder
- 14 published his papers, that no research had been done
- 15 at BATCO on the subject of whether cigarette smoking
- 16 causes cancer and that -- or let's put it that way.
- 17 Let me rephrase the question.
- 18 Isn't it a fact that at the time Wynder
- 19 published his papers, that BATCO had done no research
- 20 on the subject of whether cigarette smoking caused
- 21 cancer?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form. Wynder
- 23 has published papers for many, many, many years. Can
- 24 you give -- be more specific, Counselor?
- MS. WIVELL: His first published papers,

- 1 sir.
- 2 A. I'm not sure when Wynder first published papers
- 3 in relation to this. My -- my guess is certainly
- 4 there was some publications by -- by Dr. Wynder in
- 5 the 1950s, mid-1950s, very much at the same time as
- 6 British-American Tobacco was setting up research
- 7 laboratories to -- to look at this issue. As to what
- 8 research or -- or certainly as to what the company
- 9 was looking at in terms of what external research was
- 10 going on, I'm not quite certain in that period.
- 11 Q. Well isn't it a fact that the research that was
- 12 done at British-American Tobacco was so secret that
- 13 that research was referred to under a code name?
- 14 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection. The question was
- 15 asked and answered.
- 16 A. Yeah, and my answer was that I believe that
- 17 was -- was the case, and it -- it somewhat surprises
- 18 me in that it was certainly public scientific
- 19 knowledge that benzopyrene was to be found in tobacco
- 20 smoke at albeit extremely small levels.
- 21 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 599 was marked
- for identification.)
- 23 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 24 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 25 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 599, this is a document that

- 1 begins with the Bates number 105471399; correct?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. And it is research from the R&D department at
- 4 British-American Tobacco Company Limited; right?
- 5 A. Yes, it is.
- 6 Q. And it's entitled "SMOKE GROUP, Programme for
- 7 coming 12-16 week period"; right?
- 8 A. Correct.
- 9 Q. The author is D. G. Felton?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Now, sir, if you took -- take a look at the next
- 12 page, we see reference to work that was being set up
- 13 to look into the idea that there was a causal
- 14 relationship between ZEPHYR and cigarette smoking;
- 15 right?
- 16 A. That's what it states here, yes.
- 17 Q. And you understand "ZEPHYR" to mean "cancer";
- 18 right?
- 19 A. I mean, I'm not certain, but I believe it
- 20 probably refers to "lung cancer," not "cancer."
- 21 Q. All right. Now if we go on in this document, we
- 22 see there's a reference on the next page to BORSTAL,
- 23 B-O-R-S-T-A-L; correct?
- 24 A. Yes, it says "BORSTAL" here.
- 25 Q. And that refers to "benzopyrene"; isn't that

- 1 true?
- 2 A. I believe that is the case. And it goes on to
- 3 talk about condensed aromatic polycyclic
- 4 hydrocarbons.
- 5 Q. All right. Now, you have no idea why this
- 6 research was undertaken with these code names, do
- 7 you, sir?
- 8 A. No. I actually have no idea why code names were
- 9 used for those substances, particularly since the
- 10 document also refers quite specifically to aromatic
- 11 polycyclic hydrocarbons.
- 12 Q. All right. Now, sir, we've also talked about
- 13 the fact that there are aromatic amines in cigarette
- 14 smoke; correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. All right. What are some of the aromatic amines
- 17 that are present in cigarette smoke when a smoker
- 18 takes a puff?
- 19 A. Well to get -- give you a complete list, maybe
- 20 I'll refer to where the -- the U.S. Surgeon General,
- 21 who in '64 gave a whole series of -- of substances
- 22 and at that time he identified as being in -- in
- 23 mainstream smoke, and in terms of, I mean, for
- 24 example, nitrogen bases, a variety of substances were
- 25 identified, including things like pyridine, nicotine,

- 1 nornicotine and substituted pyridine bases and a
- 2 whole list. I'm not sure. I think it probably is
- 3 tabulated here, a whole list of substances identified
- 4 at that time, in 1964, of substances that are found
- 5 in tobacco smoke.
- 6 Q. All right. Well before the Surgeon General came
- 7 out with his report in 1964, had British-American
- 8 Tobacco Company or any of the B.A.T. Group companies
- 9 informed the public that it knew that those amines
- 10 were present in cigarette smoke?
- 11 A. As far as I'm aware, not.
- 12 Q. And isn't it a fact that before the Surgeon
- 13 General came out with his report in 1964, none of the
- 14 B.A.T. Group companies had alerted the public to the
- 15 fact that polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons were
- 16 present in cigarette smoke?
- 17 A. Again, I gather that's the case.
- 18 Q. Now, sir, if we look back at Plaintiffs' Exhibit
- 19 598 --
- 20 A. Sorry, 598?
- 21 Q. 598.
- 22 A. That is -- let me see. Yeah, I've got that
- 23 one.
- 24 Q. There is a section entitled "Carcinogenicity in
- 25 animals" beginning on the second page; right?

- 1 A. This again is -- that report refers to the
- 2 International Agency for Research on -- on Cancer's
- 3 monograph, and yeah, the second page talks about
- 4 "Carcinogenicity in animals."
- 5 Q. Well, sir, who wrote this document?
- 6 A. Let me have a look. It's not clear. I mean,
- 7 what is scribbled -- oh, sorry. What is handwritten
- 8 on the top says "Lyon 2 to 12 to 2 to 20, 19" -- I
- 9 believe it's "85," but I'm not certain, and then it
- 10 goes "IARC," which stands for the "International
- 11 Agency for Research on Cancer," and I believe it says
- 12 "Monograph Volume" -- oh, I can't really read it.
- 13 Maybe "30."
- MR. SHEFFLER: I think it's "3P."
- 15 A. "3P."
- 16 Q. Sir, you don't --
- 17 A. So, I mean, what my assumption would be is this
- 18 is a -- a monograph written by the International
- 19 Agency for Research on Cancer, who were based on --
- 20 in Lyon.
- 21 MR. SHEFFLER: Actually it's "Monograph
- 22 Volume 30," which is the --
- 23 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think it is "30."
- MR. SHEFFLER: -- final monograph.
- 25 Q. Sir, do you know that to be a fact?

- 1 A. No, I don't. From the piece of paper that
- 2 you've given me, all -- and that's the only
- 3 indication and I haven't had real time to look
- 4 through all of this, but that's the only indication
- 5 to me as to where this document comes from.
- 6 Q. Now, sir, if we turn back to the second page, we
- 7 see a reference to "Carcinogenicity in animals";
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. There's a highlighted -- under -- there's a
- 10 subtitle underlined which says "Carcinogenicity in
- 11 animals, "yeah.
- 12 Q. And it goes on in that paragraph to refer to
- 13 "Exposure of hamsters and rats to whole smoke results
- 14 in the induction of malignant respiratory-tract
- 15 tumors"; correct?
- 16 A. Yeah, it does say that.
- 17 Q. All right. And British-American Tobacco Company
- 18 never informed the public that -- or the people
- 19 smoking its cigarettes that exposure to smoke
- 20 resulted in the induction of malignant
- 21 respiratory-tract tumors; right?
- 22 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to the question as
- 23 compound. Do you want to ask him whether they
- 24 informed the public, however that's defined, or the
- 25 people smoking its cigarettes?

- 1 MS. WIVELL: All right, let me rephrase the
- 2 question.
- 3 Q. British-American Tobacco Company never informed
- 4 the public that smoking cigarettes exposed people to
- 5 smoke which resulted in the induction -- had resulted
- 6 in the induction of malignant respiratory-tract
- 7 tumors in animals?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 9 question as "public" is undefined, if it's not meant
- 10 to mean consumers.
- 11 A. To -- to answer your question, as far as I know,
- 12 British-American Tobacco, for example, has not
- 13 repeated the statements of -- of IARC, if this is an
- 14 IARC document, which if it is Volume 30, IARC
- 15 monograph, it's certainly very much part of the
- 16 scientific -- the body of scientific review on these
- 17 matters. Has British-American Tobacco specifically
- 18 reissued some statements that IARC have made? No, I
- 19 gather not.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, if we turn to the page that ends with
- 21 Bates number 496, it talks about "Cancer in humans."
- 22 Do you see that heading?
- 23 A. I see that subheading, yeah.
- 24 Q. And it says "Lung cancer is believed to be the
- 25 most important cause of death from cancer in the

- 1 world, with estimated total deaths in excess of
- 2 1 million annually"; right?
- 3 A. That's what it says here. It's -- presumably
- 4 this is the view of the International Agency for
- 5 Research on Cancer.
- 6 Q. All right. Well whether it's their view or not,
- 7 let me ask you this: Isn't it true that B.A.T.
- 8 Industries or BATCO or any of the -- strike that.
- 9 Now whether it's their view or not, isn't it a
- 10 fact that none of the B.A.T. Group companies have
- 11 ever told smokers that lung cancer is the most
- 12 important cause of death in the world?
- 13 A. I don't think that is -- is something we have
- 14 said and I don't think that would perhaps be an
- 15 accurate statement even that the public health
- 16 authorities would say. I think what is likely is
- 17 that cardiovascular disease is the most important
- 18 death -- in terms of what it says here, is the most
- 19 important death -- cause of death from -- from cancer
- 20 in the world. I mean, that is certainly a view that
- 21 clearly is being promoted by the International Agency
- 22 for Research on Cancer in here. And no, I do not
- 23 believe that that is something that British-American
- 24 Tobacco has repeated.
- 25 Q. Well it goes on to say the major cause of death

- 1 is cigarette smoking, primarily -- I'm sorry, strike
- 2 that.
- 3 It goes on here to say "The major cause of ...
- 4 disease is tobacco smoking, primarily of cigarettes";
- 5 correct?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. And you would agree that none of the B.A.T.
- 8 Group companies have ever told the public that the
- 9 major cause of disease is tobacco smoking?
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Object to the form of the
- 11 question.
- 12 A. Again, as far as I can -- as I know, I don't
- 13 think anyone or British-American Tobacco has repeated
- 14 what -- what the International Agency for Research on
- 15 Cancer say in this document, and, I mean, certainly
- 16 the statements here by the International Agency for
- 17 Research on Cancer very much reflect what the World
- 18 Health Organization would say on that matter, and
- 19 that is certainly something which has been promoted
- 20 extraordinarily widely by the World Health
- 21 Organization.
- 22 Q. Well, sir, putting aside what other people might
- 23 have said, I'm trying to find out what the B.A.T.
- 24 Group has said, and isn't it a fact that the B.A.T.
- 25 Group has never told the public that the major cause

- 1 of disease is tobacco smoking, preliminary --
- 2 primarily of cigarettes?
- 3 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to statements of
- 4 counsel, and I object that that precise question was
- 5 asked and was precisely answered by the witness.
- 6 A. And -- and again, the answer is, I mean, to my
- 7 knowledge, no, British-American Tobacco has not
- 8 issued a -- a press release which repeats what the
- 9 International Agency for Research on Cancer has said
- 10 in this document.
- 11 Q. Well now, sir, do you agree that the risk of
- 12 lung cancer in smokers is particularly dependent on
- 13 the duration of smoking?
- 14 A. If we look at the epidemiological data that's
- 15 been produced for many years and you look at that
- 16 data as -- as it's revealed in -- in the various
- 17 Surgeon General's report and in -- in the reports of
- 18 the Independent Scientific Committee on Smoking and
- 19 Health from the U.K., what they will say is that
- 20 looking at epidemiology, the relative risk within
- 21 groups of people would increase; therefore, I mean,
- 22 the -- the incidence of -- of lung cancer increase if
- 23 the duration of -- of smoking is longer.
- 24 Q. All right. Well, has BATCO or any of the B.A.T.
- 25 Group companies ever told the public that the risk of

- 1 cigarette -- of lung cancer is dependent on the
- 2 duration of smoking?
- 3 A. I mean, I don't think British-American Tobacco
- 4 has -- has specifically issued a press release or in
- 5 any other way talked about that other than reflecting
- 6 what the views of the public health authority have
- 7 been. And clearly, I mean, even in the 1962 Royal
- 8 College of Physicians report in London that was the
- 9 view of the community, and certainly in the 1964 U.S.
- 10 Surgeon General's report on smoking and health that
- 11 was also the view.
- 12 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my
- 13 question is not what the -- what the view of the
- 14 Surgeon General was. My question is whether any of
- 15 the B.A.T. Group companies have ever told the public
- 16 that essentially the risk of lung cancer is dependent
- 17 on the duration of smoking.
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: I -- I object. Again, that
- 19 specific question was asked and it was specifically
- 20 answered by the witness, and I object to counsel's
- 21 statements as a predicate to the question.
- MR. FRANKEL: I also object to -- to "the
- 23 public," by which I'm not sure if you mean the U.S.
- 24 public, the U. -- the British public, both or --
- MS. WIVELL: If you have an objection,

- 1 please, Counsel, just state the word "objection." I
- 2 don't need you coaching the witness too.
- 3 MR. FRANKEL: That's --
- 4 MR. SHEFFLER: You know, that's really very
- 5 improper. That is -- that's inappropriate. There
- 6 has been no coaching of the witness in this
- 7 deposition, and it's inappropriate for you to make
- 8 such comments on the record.
- 9 MR. FRANKEL: It's an ambiguous question
- 10 and that's -- that's the grounds for my objection and
- 11 I'm stating it.
- 12 A. I'm sorry, can you repeat the question again.
- 13 Q. Certainly. My question is not what the view of
- 14 the Surgeon General was, sir. My question is whether
- 15 any of the B.A.T. Group companies have ever told the
- 16 public that the risk of lung cancer is dependent on
- 17 the duration of smoking.
- 18 MR. SHEFFLER: That question was asked and
- 19 specifically answered by the witness, and I object to
- 20 the repetitive -- repetitive nature of all of these
- 21 questions.
- 22 A. And let me try and help with an answer again.
- 23 Excuse me. As far as I know -- excuse me a second.
- 24 Thanks.
- 25 As far as I know, British-American Tobacco have

- 1 not precisely set out a -- a public statement talking
- 2 about -- actually sorry, I'm -- I was choking. Can
- 3 you repeat the question. I'll give you a -- a proper
- 4 response.
- 5 Q. Certainly. My question is not what the view of
- 6 the Surgeon General was, sir. My question is whether
- 7 any of the B.A.T. Group companies have ever told the
- 8 public that the risk of lung cancer is dependent on
- 9 the duration of smoking.
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: Same --
- 11 MR. FRANKEL: Same objection.
- MR. SHEFFLER: Same objection.
- 13 A. I think that in various documents that we've
- 14 certainly written in relation to smoking and health,
- 15 I mean, those documents would certainly reflect what
- 16 is certainly the statements of the public health
- 17 authorities and what the statistical studies tend to
- 18 show, which is if -- the greater the duration of
- 19 smoke, the -- the greater the relative risk that's
- 20 found in the epidemiological studies.
- In terms of speaking to the public, no, we
- 22 haven't made many public statements because generally
- 23 in the public the information has been taken from --
- 24 from the public health authorities. But where we
- 25 have stated and certainly where there is

- 1 epidemiological data that -- that shows a particular
- 2 effect, we have never tried to state to the contrary
- 3 that effect.
- 4 Q. Well have you ever told young smokers that the
- 5 earlier they start smoking, the greater their
- 6 individual risk of getting disease?
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Is -- is that the end of the
- 8 question?
- 9 MS. WIVELL: (Nodding head.)
- 10 MR. SHEFFLER: I object to the assumptions
- 11 in the question and -- and I object to the form.
- 12 A. If I or has British-American Tobacco
- 13 specifically sent out messages to -- to young
- 14 smokers, however that's defined, in relation to that,
- 15 no, and again it's my view that the people who choose
- 16 to smoke are well aware of -- of where the public
- 17 health authorities have come out on this matter.
- 18 Certainly in the United Kingdom there has been a
- 19 whole series of programs by the U.K. government
- 20 talking about what people should do if they -- they
- 21 still choose to smoke, and that includes reduct --
- 22 reducing the duration of smoking. It includes -- it
- 23 includes changing behavior; for example, choosing
- 24 lower-tar products and smoking those lower-tar
- 25 products with -- with less puffs, et cetera.

- 1 Q. Well, sir, it says here "Risk of lung cancer is
- 2 particularly dependent on duration of smoking;
- 3 therefore, the earlier the age at initiation of
- 4 smoking, the greater the individual risk"; correct?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. And --
- 7 MR. SHEFFLER: Let the record reflect
- 8 that -- that the counsel for plaintiffs is reading
- 9 from Exhibit 598.
- 10 Q. And, sir, isn't it a fact that none of the
- 11 B.A.T. Group companies have ever let smokers who
- 12 smoke their cigarettes know that the earlier the age
- 13 of initiation of smoking, the greater the individual
- 14 risk?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 16 question, objection to the assumptions built into the
- 17 question.
- 18 A. I mean, again the -- the question raises the
- 19 issue of what is public knowledge on this issue, and
- 20 clearly it is public knowledge as -- as presented
- 21 certainly in the U.K. through the public health
- 22 authorities and the U.S. through the public health
- 23 authorities. Is the question have we repeated that?
- 24 The answer is probably no. Is -- is the question
- 25 have we done anything that -- which would take away

- 1 from the public's view of -- of where the public
- 2 health authorities have come out? The answer is no.
- 3 Q. Well, sir, if you turn to the page that ends
- 4 with Bates number 498, you see there the statement
- 5 "Tobacco smoking (particularly of cigarettes) is an
- 6 important cause of bladder cancer and cancer of the
- 7 renal pelvis." Do you see that, sir?
- 8 MR. SHEFFLER: Again -- again let the
- 9 record reflect that counsel's again reading from
- 10 Exhibit 598, which has been identified for the
- 11 record.
- 12 A. I'm sorry, I can't find that. The bottom bit
- 13 talks about pancreatic cancer.
- 14 Q. The third --
- The second complete paragraph, sir, begins with
- 16 the statement "Tobacco smoking (particularly of
- 17 cigarettes) is an important cause of bladder cancer
- 18 and cancer of the renal pelvis"; right?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. And did any of the B.A.T. companies ever let the
- 21 public know that cigarette smoking was an important
- 22 cause of bladder cancer?
- 23 A. I mean, again my answer, as -- as in the
- 24 previous questions, is that, to my knowledge, no,
- 25 British-American Tobacco hasn't specifically set out

- 1 to inform the public of the views of the
- 2 International Agency for Research on Cancer, which --
- 3 whose views I think are -- are promoted certainly
- 4 by -- by those who have been discussing this matter
- 5 in the public.
- 6 Q. Well, sir, international associations aside, it
- 7 is a fact, isn't it, that none of the B.A.T. Group
- 8 companies have ever informed the public that tobacco
- 9 smoking was an important cause of bladder or renal
- 10 cancer?
- 11 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to -- objection to
- 12 the form of the question. You can't --
- MS. WIVELL: All right, then I'll restate
- 14 the question.
- MR. SHEFFLER: You can't read from a
- 16 document and then say put the document aside and ask
- 17 the question.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, statements of international associations or
- 20 Surgeon Generals aside, isn't it true that the B.A.T.
- 21 Group companies have never told the public that
- 22 tobacco smoking is an important cause of bladder
- 23 cancer?
- 24 MR. SHEFFLER: Objection to the form of the
- 25 question, same objection.

- 1 A. British-American Tobacco has never issued a
- 2 release to -- to that effect to confirm what the
- 3 International Agency for Research on Cancer have been
- 4 saying and -- and particularly saying through the
- 5 World Health Organization, as far as I'm aware.
- 6 Q. Now, sir, this document goes on to talk about
- 7 tobacco smoking being an -- an important cause of
- 8 oro --
- 9 MR. SHEFFLER: Oropharyngeal.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Thank you.
- 12 Q. And other kinds of cancers; correct?
- 13 A. Yeah, it says "oropharyngeal, hypopharyngeal,
- 14 laryngeal and oesophageal cancers, " yeah.
- 15 Q. And isn't it true that none of the B.A.T. Group
- 16 companies have ever informed the public that smoking
- 17 their cigarettes would cause those kinds of cancers?
- MR. SHEFFLER: Let the record reflect again
- 19 that counsel's reading from the document, that
- 20 Exhibit 598.
- 21 MR. FRANKEL: I object to form.
- 22 A. And I think the answer again is -- is I do not
- 23 believe that British-American Tobacco has -- has put
- 24 a precise statement out, nor has it, I don't think,
- 25 in terms of the public environment tried to take away

- 1 from what the International Agency for Research on
- 2 Cancer and -- and then obviously the World Health
- 3 Organization has said in terms of its view on those
- 4 matters.
- 5 Q. Sir, it's also true, isn't it, that the B.A.T.
- 6 Group companies have never told the public that there
- 7 is sufficient evidence that tobacco smoke is
- 8 carcinogenic in human beings?
- 9 MR. FRANKEL: Same objection.
- 10 A. No. Again I think, I mean, given that it's the
- 11 view of the International Agency for Research on
- 12 Cancer and something that certainly the World Health
- 13 Organization promotes as part of -- of its public
- 14 health policy around the world, no, I do not believe
- 15 that British-American Tobacco has repeated that
- 16 statement.
- MS. WIVELL: All right. Why don't we stop
- 18 for the day.
- 19 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 20 (Deposition recessed at 5:28 o'clock
- 21 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, William C. LaBorde, hereby certify that
3	I am qualified as a verbatim shorthand reporter; that
4	I took in stenographic shorthand the testimony of
5	CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR at the time and place
6	aforesaid; and that the foregoing transcript
7	consisting of pages 1 through 307 is a true and
8	correct, full and complete transcription of said
9	shorthand notes, to the best of my ability.
10	Dated at New York, New York, this 12 day of
11	August 1997.
12	
13	
14	
15	WILLIAM C. LaBORDE
16	Registered Professional Reporter
17	Notary Public
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR, the deponent,
3	hereby certify that I have read the foregoing
4	transcript consisting of pages 1 through 307, and
5	that said transcript is a true and correct, full and
6	complete transcription of my deposition, except per
7	the attached corrections, if any.
8	
9	(Please check one.)
10	
11	Yes, changes were made per the attached
12	(no.) pages.
13	
14	No changes were made.
15	
16	
17	CHRISTOPHER J. PROCTOR
18	Deponent
19	
20	Sworn and subscribed to before me this day
21	of 199
22	
23	
24	Notary Public
25	My commission expires: (WCL)
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953